MATTHEW'S SAYINGS OF JESUS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY
NEW YORK

THE J. K. GILL COMPANY
PORTLAND, OREGON

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY
SHANGHAI

MATTHEW'S SAYINGS OF JESUS

THE NON-MARKAN COMMON SOURCE OF MATTHEW AND LUKE

By

GEORGE DEWITT CASTOR

Late Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in the Pacific School of Religion

LIBRARY OF
Bancbrake Theolo[illegible]inary
BS
2555
.C3
2088a

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

NO LONGER PROPERTY OF
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

COPYRIGHT 1918 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

All Rights Reserved

Published April 1918

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

PREFACE

The main argument of this monograph was read in an address before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, December, 1906, and during the following year was developed in more detail and presented as a Doctor's thesis. In offering it now for publication the writer has made only a few minor changes. This monograph presupposes an acquaintance with the main features of the synoptic problem, and can hope to appeal only to those New Testament students who are interested in the Gospels as historical sources. The great difference of opinion existing among scholars regarding the non-Markan common material of Matthew and Luke is sufficient justification for further discussion of the subject. Any real contribution toward the solution of this baffling problem is sure to be welcomed. The writer, therefore, in presenting the results of his study can only hope that scholars will find here something worthy of their consideration. Every page will show how dependent he has been on the many who have

labored in this field, but his especial gratitude is due to Professor Benjamin W. Bacon, Professor Charles F. Kent, and Professor Shirley J. Case for their encouragement and suggestions.

GEORGE D. CASTOR

BERKELEY, CAL.

POSTSCRIPT

It has been a great pleasure to have the privilege of seeing through the press the work of my friend and former classmate, Professor Castor, whose promising career was cut short by a tragic accident in the summer of 1912. At that time his manuscript was in final shape for printing, and it is now published exactly as left by the author at the moment of his untimely death. Regrettable as is the delay in publication, the value of the book is not thereby appreciably impaired. In the meantime no treatise has appeared rendering Professor Castor's discussion superfluous, nor has the importance of his contribution to scholarly discussion of the synoptic problem diminished. Students of the subject will welcome this fresh and vigorous treatment of a very perplexing theme.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
March 16, 1918

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION BY PROFESSOR BENJAMIN W. BACON 1

CHAPTER

I. INFERENCES FROM MATTHEW'S AND LUKE'S USE OF THE SOURCE, MARK 7

II. LITERARY STUDY OF ALL THE COMMON MATERIAL IN SECTIONS 19

III. THE SEQUENCE OF PARALLEL SECTIONS IN MATTHEW AND LUKE 120

IV. UNITY AND COMPLETENESS OF THE COMMON MATERIAL IN MATTHEW AND LUKE . . . 140

V. RELATION OF THE COMMON SOURCE TO THE INDEPENDENT MATERIAL OF LUKE . . . 162

VI. RELATION OF THE COMMON SOURCE TO THE INDEPENDENT MATERIAL OF MATTHEW . . 182

VII. RELATION OF THE COMMON SOURCE TO MARK 189

VIII. THE APOSTOLIC ORIGIN OF THE COMMON SOURCE 208

IX. MATTHEW'S SAYINGS OF JESUS AS RECONSTRUCTED 217

INTRODUCTION

No more fascinating problem exists for the student of the life of Christ than the reconstruction of that primitive document which modern criticism has proved to underlie our Gospels of Matthew and Luke; for such is the necessary source of the elements which these Gospels coincidently add to Mark.

A century's tireless scrutiny of the interrelation of our three interdependent Gospels issues, we are now assured by many writers, in but one surely established result: Our Matthew and Luke have been framed upon our Mark, transcribing from it their main outline of the story of Jesus. So far as narrative of the ministry is concerned, scarcely any other document seems in their time to have come into serious consideration besides that which earliest tradition pronounced a record of the preaching of Peter.

This is a result of immense and far-reaching importance. But until supplemented by the assurance that Matthew and Luke have done this work

independently we have no guaranty that the non-Markan elements wherein they coincide are not drawn by one from the other, or by both from an indefinite number of sources, oral or written. This second step—the mutual independence of Matthew and Luke—has been made probable by many. Critics point among other things to the utter lack of relation displayed in the opening and closing chapters of Matthew and Luke, each toward the other, and the completely different disposal of their common non-Markan or "double-tradition" material, which it is now usual to designate "Q." To the present writer, however, the probability seems to be carried to the point of real demonstration first in Wernle's comparison in his *Synoptische Frage* of the treatment of Mark by Matthew and Luke, respectively. The fact established by Wernle that not one probable instance can be shown throughout the material thus employed (including as it does practically the entire Gospel of Mark) wherein either of the later evangelists seems to have been influenced in his modifications by the other, adds the capstone to the edifice of the so-called "two-document" theory.

On the basis of this presumption that Matthew and Luke are mutually independent, and hence in their coincident supplements to Mark were drawing in the main from a common source, attempts have repeatedly been made to reconstruct it. Results have on the whole been disappointing. The process and the proof are in the main dictated by the conditions of the case. The Mark element must be subtracted on both sides, and the remainder, so far as common to Matthew and Luke, must be scrutinized for evidences of organic unity. The non-Markan remainder is indeed in large part coincident, and this Q element does turn out to be almost wholly of the teaching or discourse type rather than narrative. This is supposed to corroborate an alleged "tradition" of Papias of an apostolic compilation of "oracles." But Papias has no such "tradition." He merely states that the "oracles" which he proposed to "interpret" are to be found in Matthew in Greek translation. Moreover, the process of reconstruction is complicated by the possible elimination of the narrative elements of Q in the process of subtracting Mark; for Mark also may have used the

same Q source. Furthermore, none of the many reconstructions has in point of fact displayed those evidences of organic unity which would justify the critic in declaring: This is manifestly a single composition, constructed with a single consistent plan and purpose, and from definable premises and points of view. On the contrary, Wernle feels compelled to set off from Q the opening sections of the reconstructed work, which relate to the Baptist and his preaching and to the baptism and temptation of Jesus as a narrative introduction. He regards this and the story of the centurion's servant as later additions, because their more narrative character seems to differentiate them from the rest of Q. They seem, therefore, to Wernle to fall outside the limits of a compilation of the "oracles." Resch sees so little coherence in the results of his predecessor Wendt as to pronounce them "a heap of interesting ruins." Harnack's results are certainly not more coherent.

Most disappointing of all, that correspondence of the results of criticism with (alleged) ancient tradition which began so promisingly with the discourse content of Q has failed to meet further expectations. Matthew, which on this theory should

give evidence in its fundamental structure of an underlying *Logia* source, is less inclined than Luke to prefer the non-Markan source. Hawkins' indication of Matthew's fivefold division through the formula καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, interesting as evidence of the compiler's ideal, leads upon further scrutiny to the undeniable result that all five of the great discourses save the first are constructed on the basis of Mark. Again, the language of Q was certainly neither Hebrew nor Aramaic. Like our own Gospels, it has traces of a Semitic original *for its elements;* but the compilation itself as used by Matthew and Luke was Greek. Finally, there is nothing to indicate for it a connection with Matthew, or indeed with any apostle. The whole identification Q = Papias' *Logia* thus breaks down entirely.

Under these circumstances it was unavoidable that scholarly effort should be reconcentrated on the problem. Methods must be perfected, results more minutely scrutinized. Recently Harnack brings to bear upon it all his critical acumen, all his experience as a historian and expert in early Christian literature. The problem is destined to be

solved, and by the method which more and more in our day is solving the great problems of common interest—the independent co-operation of many workers.

For the competence of Professor Castor to undertake this intricate task, even though the results of his years of labor were set down too soon after the publication of Harnack's able and elaborate treatment to permit employment of it, the work itself gives ample evidence. The reader will not need to be assured of Professor Castor's scholarly spirit, nor of his many years of schooling for his task in the best university training at home and abroad. So far as a former teacher's words can properly aim at more than an honorary function, they must express the sincere conviction that Professor Castor has something of value to say whereby the solution of this vital problem of criticism is really promoted. By the co-operation of many thus minded have the triumphs of critical research been achieved in the past. By similar co-operation this paramount problem of gospel criticism is also destined to be solved.

BENJAMIN W. BACON
YALE UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER I

INFERENCES FROM MATTHEW'S AND LUKE'S USE OF THE SOURCE, MARK

Proceeding on the principle that we ought to argue from the better to the less known, before taking up the question of a second source at all we should study the use which Matthew and Luke make of Mark. It is not often that we have such an opportunity to learn the methods of compilers whose work we would investigate. That Matthew and Luke both used Mark in some form not essentially different from the present Gospel is one of the assured results of modern criticism.[1]

Considering Luke first, the following characteristics of his use of Mark are significant for our purpose. His editorial work is not a use of mere scissors and paste; the text of Mark is freely revised, and even in the words of Jesus little care is

[1] The evidence for this has nowhere been more convincingly presented than by Ernest DeWitt Burton in *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem.*

exercised to preserve the language of Mark.[1] The changes Luke makes are not only linguistic—he frequently adds his own comments and interpretations—but the purpose of such changes is practical and not dogmatic. Again, Mark is seldom combined with other sources, at least not before the Passion narratives. The account of the rejection at Nazareth and the call of the first disciples are the only clear cases, and there little more than a trace of Mark's influence is discernible. Surprisingly few changes are made in the order of Mark.[2] The few which are made only show that the author's adherence to Mark's order is not due to any special reverence for it, but rather to his general method of using sources. Material foreign to Mark is practically all gathered into two compact groups (6:20—8:3; 9:51—18:14). Without entering into the problem of Luke's one considerable omission from Mark's account, Mark 6:45—8:26,

[1] Cf. Luke 5:36–39 with Mark 2:21, 22 and Luke 8:11–15 with Mark 4:14–20. In both cases the comparison shows, not two sources, but an interpretation of Mark by Luke. They illustrate how freely at times he changes Mark.

[2] Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage*, p. 7, counts seven changes in order; 3:19 ff.; 4:16 ff.; 5:1 ff.; 6:12–16; 8:19–21; 22:15–20; 22:66–71.

we notice that he is inclined to omit matters of merely Jewish interest, as the account of John the Baptist's death,[1] or what might trouble his readers, as Jesus' reproof of Peter. Luke's omissions from Mark with the one exception are easily accounted for. In nine instances[2] Luke abandons Mark for a variant account, and two incidents of his great omission (Mark 8:11–13; 8:14–21) are paralleled in his other material. In seven of the total eleven instances the variant account is one which Matthew and Luke have in common. A comparison with Matthew shows that where there are two parallel accounts, one in Mark and the other in that material which Luke has in common with Matthew alone, he seems to show a preference for the latter. Luke seeks to avoid duplicates, but has not always succeeded. We shall now be prepared to find that Luke changes freely the language of his other source common to Matthew, makes his own editorial additions and interpretations, but holds closely to the order which he finds. He will omit what would

[1] Possibly Luke's omission here is also due to better information.

[2] Mark 3:22–30; 4:30–23; 9:42; 9:50; 10:2–12; 10:35–45; 11:12–14, 20–32; 12:28–34; 14:3–9.

be uninteresting or displeasing to his readers, but, if anything, we shall expect him to be more faithful in preserving this other source than in his use of Mark.

Turning to Matthew, we notice that here there are more sayings of Jesus retained in the language of Mark,[1] and more similarity throughout in the vocabulary, but in the great majority of cases here, as in Luke, Mark's wording is freely changed. In thought also Matthew adheres more closely to Mark than Luke does, but, like the third evangelist, he adds his own reflections and makes his own adaptations. On the other hand, changes in the order are more frequent in Matthew, and these changes seem due to a desire for more systematic grouping. Again, where Luke would choose between sources Matthew usually combines them. Such combinations are frequent. Jesus' defense against the Beelzebul charge is an excellent passage for studying Matthew's method in weaving variant accounts together. Matthew has twice[2] as many

[1] Wernle, pp. 11, 130, counts nine instances in Matt., four in Luke; one is surprised that there are so few.

[2] Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 64–87, counts ten in Luke, twenty-two in Matt.

doublets as Luke. Where the third evangelist has a preference for their other common source, the first regularly prefers Mark. This tendency to combine, and closer adherence to Mark, is the most striking difference between the two Gospels, as far as we are concerned. His preference for Mark is probably one reason why Matthew omits so little from that source. The few omissions he does make show that he is influenced by the value of the material for teaching purposes. Judging, then, from Matthew's use of Mark, we shall expect him to be closer to his source in language than Luke, with fewer editorial changes or additions, but with more freedom in order. His tendency toward systematic arrangement and fondness for combination will naturally have a wider scope in groups of sayings than in narratives. He will not be likely to omit much that is significant as teaching. On the other hand, Matthew's constant preference for Mark to his other source is always to be kept in mind, qualifying what we have just said. In this connection the conclusion Sir John Hawkins reached in a purely linguistic investigation is valuable: "It follows therefore that in Matthew

the characteristic expressions are used with considerably more freedom and abundance in the presumably Logian portion than in the presumably Markan; while in Luke they are used a little less freely and abundantly in the presumably Logian than in the presumably Markan portions."[1]

Our examination of the editorial use which Matthew and Luke make of Mark is not altogether encouraging to the student who would reconstruct any other source used by these evangelists. "We see clearly enough," says F. C. Burkitt,[2] "that we could not have reconstructed the Gospel according to St. Mark out of the other two Synoptic Gospels, although between them nearly all Mark has been incorporated by Matthew and Luke. How futile, therefore, it is to attempt to reconstruct those other literary sources which seem to have been used by Matthew and Luke, but have not been independently preserved!" Some of the most important characteristics of Mark, both in literary quality and in subject-matter, have entirely dis-

[1] *Horae Synopticae*, p. 91. Sharman's *The Teaching of Jesus about the Future*, pp. 5, 9, gives independent support to these summaries of editorial principles.

[2] *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, p. 17.

appeared from Matthew and Luke. These evangelists have put their own stamp upon their material. And yet the hope for the reconstruction of a second common source is not so desperate as might be thought. In the first place, we have the source, Mark, to use as a guide in eliminating the editorial work of the evangelists. Again, with Mark before us we can study the remaining common material by itself. It is at least possible that we shall find there a literary resemblance, a common sequence, a unity, and a completeness that will assure us of a single source which we may know in part even if we cannot restore it in detail. Bearing witness to the presence of such evidence is the work of prominent scholars like Wellhausen and Harnack, and they are only two among many. The general character of the non-Markan common material also offers hope; we shall find that it consists largely of sayings of Jesus rather than narrative, and we have a right to expect from the evangelists a closer adherence to their source in what they recognized as words of the Master.

One must be impressed with the number of verses in the non-Markan common material where

Matthew and Luke agree verbally. The following verses are practically identical in the two accounts; only slight changes in a word here and there can be found:

Matt.	3:7*b*–10, 12 =	Luke 3:7*b*–9, 17
	7:3–5 =	6:41, 42
	8:8–10 =	7:6*b*–9
	11:3*b*–11, 16–19 =	7:19*b*, 22–28, 31–35
	8:19–22 =	9:57–60*a*
	9:37, 38 =	10:2
	10:16*a* =	10:3
10:15 (=11:24)	11:21–23*a* =	10:12–15
	11:25*b*–27 =	10:21, 22
	13:17 =	10:24
	7:7–11 =	11:9–11, 13
	12:26*b*–28, 30 =	11:18*b*, 19, 20, 23
	12:43–45 =	11:24–26
	12:41, 42 =	11:32, 31
	6:22 =	11:34*a*(?)
	10:26*b*, 28*a*, 30, 31 =	12:2, 4*a*, 7
	6:21, 25–33 =	12:22–31, 34
	24:43–51 =	12:39, 40, 42–46
	13:33 =	13:20, 21
	23:37–39 =	13:34, 35
	6:24 =	16:13
	24:38*b*, 39*a*, 28 =	17:27, 37*b*

This makes a total of seventy-five verses where the agreement is long enough to be measured by sentences. To this we should add the list of

striking words and short phrases, common to both Gospels in this material, which is given by Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 43 ff. This verbal agreement becomes very significant when we compare Matthew and Luke in the Markan material. Nowhere there do we find such extended agreements as here. In all those portions dependent on Mark up to the entrance into Jerusalem, only in the following sixteen verses can the agreement be compared with that of the other common material:

Matt. 8:2*b*, 3, 4*b*=	Luke 5:12*b*, 13, 14*b*
9:5, 6=	5:23, 24
9:12=	5:31
9:15*b*=	9:35*a*
12:4=	6:4
12:8=	6:5
9:20*b*=	8:44*a*
13:3*b*, 4=	8:5
14:19*b*=	9:16
16:21*b*, 24, 25=	9:22*b*, 23, 24
19:14=	18:16

There is almost five times as much of such resemblance in the non-Markan common material as in the first ten chapters of Mark; and yet the sections in which that likeness is found do not bulk as large as these ten chapters. Allowing fully the

importance of harmonizing tendencies and the possibilities of accurate oral transmission, we may still say that further language test is not needed; and any theory to fit the facts of the case must recognize that we have here a common written source or sources written in Greek. B. W. Bacon has well said that those who find an oral source here make their oral source the equivalent of a document, since its form is so stereotyped as to make the resemblance of Matthew to Luke closer in the portions not shared by Mark than in the parts taken by each from this admittedly written source. The only alternative is to suppose that Matthew used Luke, or Luke, Matthew. W. C. Allen's attempt in his commentary on Matthew to revive such a theory has hardly been a success. He has thereby raised more problems than he has solved, and is himself compelled to fall back upon the hypothesis of a common source. The comparison made with Mark ought, furthermore, to give us a practical certainty that this source or sources included more than the seventy-five verses where the verbal agreement is so complete. Even in the sayings of Jesus it is very common for the

first and third evangelists to change Mark's words and phrases, but oftentimes while doing this to retain his sentence structure and sequence of thought. We should expect to find the same true in their use of other sources.

In order to free our discussion of any presuppositions involved in the name employed, we will adopt the German designation Q(Quelle) for this other source or sources, whose character and limits we are trying to define. Wellhausen in his commentaries and introduction has most convincingly shown that the material usually assigned to Q is a translation of an Aramaic original. Recent research in Hellenistic Greek modifies the force of some of his arguments, but his conclusions still hold. Semitic scholars also argue that some variations of Matthew and Luke are due to mistranslations of the Aramaic. We should recognize that the Aramaic original must for some time have existed side by side with the more widely used Greek copies, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that changes here and there in Greek manuscripts were made by persons familiar with the Aramaic. But there is always a large subjective element

in such conjectural misreadings, and the contention is still questionable. Granting, then, the possibility of some variations due to the Aramaic original, we must still hold to the fact of a common Greek source. This is recognized by Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, p. 68.

CHAPTER II

LITERARY STUDY OF ALL THE COMMON MATERIAL IN SECTIONS

The primary object of this detailed examination will be to decide just how much of the common material can with any assurance be attributed to a written source or sources. At the same time an effort will be made to eliminate editorial characteristics, but with the understanding that such elimination does not restore all the special qualities of Q. Luke's order will be used tentatively, because he has proved to be more reliable in retaining the sequence of Mark.

SECTION I. THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST, MATT. 3:7–12; LUKE 3:7–9, 15–18

In Luke 3:7*b*–9; Matt. 3:7*b*–10, 12 we find the first instance of that close verbal resemblance which is extended enough to be conclusive evidence that this section belongs to some common source. W. C. Allen in his commentary on Matthew denies this and urges three objections: "(*a*) the different descriptions of the audience,

(*b*) the absence of Luke vss. 10–14 from Matthew, (*c*) the variations in language." Are these points well taken? Luke 3:10–14 readily distinguishes itself from the rest of this passage in the Third Gospel by differences both in language and in thought. While vss. 7–9, 15–18 are full of Semiticisms—ποιήσατε καρπούς, ἄρξησθε, the play on words, λίθων . . . . τέκνα (abanim . . . . banim), οὗ . . . . αὐτοῦ—vss. 10–14 are singularly free from them. These verses reflect the characteristic Lukan emphasis on almsgiving, publicans, and sinners. Luke vss. 15, 18, which are wanting in Matthew, are clearly editorial additions. The connection between Matt. 3:10 and 3:11, broken by Luke 3:10–14, is restored by Luke 3:15. The language of both verses is strongly Lukan.

The introduction, which describes the audience, Luke 3:7*a;* Matt. 3:7*a*, does vary in the two Gospels; but it is noteworthy that it is just such settings in Mark which the first and third evangelists most freely change. Matthew is fond of introducing references to the Pharisees and Sadducees, but Luke is equally fond of referring to the multitudes. Of the two, the wording of Luke

seems preferable, but what stood in Q must remain doubtful, Harnack[1] has very plausibly suggested that the phrase πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ιορδάνου, Luke 3:3; Matt. 3:5, is a fragment of the Q introduction.

Variations of language are few and easily explained. Luke 3:16; Matt. 3:11 are found also in Mark 1:7–8 and the influence of Mark accounts for the wider difference between Matthew and Luke just here. Luke especially has departed from Q and followed Mark instead. The ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ of this verse may have been taken by both evangelists from Mark. Only πυρί is required by the context, but it is quite possible that Holy Spirit and fire stood together in the source Q. The change of ἄρξησθε, Luke 3:8, to δόξητε, Matt. 3:9, is a "deliberate improvement of an original preserved by Luke."[2] J. H. Moulton also maintains in the *Expositor*, May, 1909, p. 413, that συνάξαι of ℵ[a], Luke 3:17, is an original reading of which συναγαγεῖν of ℵ*B and συνάξει of Matthew are

[1] *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 41. Quotations from Harnack, unless otherwise stated, are taken from this book.

[2] J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Prolegomena, p. 15.

alternate and independent corrections. Nowhere in Markan material is a common source so evident behind Matthew and Luke as it is here.

SECTION 2. THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS, LUKE 4:1–13; MATT. 4:1–11

In this section we do not find any extended verbal agreement, and yet literary evidence of a common Greek source is not wanting. The only sayings of Jesus here are LXX quotations, and these are alike, except that Matthew has continued the quotation from Deut. 8:3 in vs. 4, and Luke that of Ps. 91:11 in vs. 11. In the quotation from Deut. 6:13 both have made the same change in the LXX, adapting it to the context. In Matt. 4:5*b*, 6; Luke 4:9*b*, 10 the verbal likeness is striking: *καὶ ἔστησεν* [*αὐτὸν*] *ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ* [λέγει] *αὐτῷ Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, βάλε σεαυτὸν* [*ἐντεῦθεν*] *κάτω γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι . . . .* This use of *πτερύγιον* is found elsewhere only in Dan. 9:27.

It is also significant that the variations can all be readily accounted for. In the introduction of Luke, vs. 1 has marked Lukan characteristics, and

vs. 2*a* is influenced by Mark. Matt., vs. 1*a*, may also be influenced by Mark. πειρασθῆναι is suspicious because of Matthew's tendency to emphasize the fulfilment of divine purpose. As usual, the introduction of the common source has been freely handled. But Matt., vs. 2, agrees with Luke, vs. 2*b*, against Mark and points at once to its presence. In vs. 11 Matthew has added the reference to the angels from Mark 1:13. The accounts of the temptations themselves differ principally in the order of the second and third temptations. Otherwise, sentence for sentence, clause for clause, the sequence of thought is the same. It is, perhaps, Luke who made the one change for the purpose of bringing the two temptations located in the wilderness together and the one in Jerusalem last. The third evangelist is especially concerned in such orderly sequence of time and place. As Harnack (p. 44) says, no argument can be based on the ὕπαγε σατανᾶ of Matt. 4:10, for it may well be an insertion on the basis of Mark 8:33.

What other differences there are reflect only the characteristics of the editorial work of Matthew

and Luke; such as Matthew's addition of *προσελθών*, vs. 3, and his use of *τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν* for Jerusalem, vs. 5. *οἰκουμένης*, Luke, vs. 5, is a favorite word of that evangelist, as *κόσμου*, Matt., vs. 8, is of the other. J. H. Moulton in the *Expositor*, May, 1909, p. 415, shows good reason for regarding Luke's *οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδέν*, vs. 2, as more original than Matthew's *νηστεύσας*. That Matthew changed the one stone into stones is made probable by his preference for plurals.[1] Luke 4:13, which Harnack rejects, strongly resembles Luke 7:1 = Matt. 7:28; 8:5, and may well belong to the source. *συντελέω* is not characteristic of Luke, but *ἄχρι καιροῦ*, which also occurs in Acts 13:11, may be an addition of the evangelist. The omission of this sentence by Matthew is due to the influence of Mark. It ought, however, to be granted that sometimes the reading of one Gospel is as probable as that of the other, and certain features of Q must have disappeared from both accounts. The important point is the demonstration that Matthew and Luke are using a common source here whose tenor can be closely approxi-

[1] W. C. Allen, *Matthew*, p. 83.

mated. If we compare this narrative with any Markan narrative we find that there is exactly the same sort and degree of resemblance in the Matthew and Luke accounts here which we find there. The theory of a common Greek source furnishes a satisfactory explanation of the resemblances and differences of the two Gospels in this section, if, indeed, it is not demanded by them.

SECTION 3. DISCOURSE ON LOVE, THE PRINCIPLE OF CONDUCT, LUKE 6:20–49; MATT. 5:1–12, 38–48; 7:1–5, 12, 16–21, 24–27

That Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is an editorial composition is all but universally recognized. Our investigation of Matthew's use of Mark has led us to anticipate such compilation and also indicates the principles which ought to guide us in an attempt to analyze it. The miracles, which Matthew has gathered together in the eighth and ninth chapters, Luke has retained, for the most part, in their Markan setting. In like manner, much of the Matthean Sermon on the Mount is found distributed in Luke. Luke therefore gives us the objective starting-point which is

needed in analyzing Matthew here. Little can be said for the view that Luke has divided the longer discourse of Matthew. No example of such division and readjustment can be found anywhere in his Markan material. But, as has already been said, greater freedom in language, and omissions and additions, especially of an explanatory, editorial character, are to be anticipated in Luke. With this justification of our point of approach let us now apply the test of Luke 6:20–49 to the composite discourse of Matthew.

Passing by the introductions, which are more or less editorial, we notice that the Beatitudes of Luke refer to conditions of life, while those peculiar to Matthew refer to spiritual virtues. Surely, mourning does not belong in the same category with mercy, and persecution, even for righteousness' sake, is not to be desired in the same sense as purity of heart. There are two elements in these Matthean Beatitudes that gain in strength and clarity when they are separated. Matthew has done a great service in emphasizing the religious quality in such words as πτωχοί and πεινῶντες, but this does not make the greater originality of Luke's form less

probable. That Matthew has here compiled is further indicated by the transition from the third to the second person in vss. 11, 12. On the other hand, the three woes of Luke 6:24–26 may be editorial amplifications of Luke. Their omission by Matthew, their relation to Luke's special material, the weak ὅτι clauses,[1] and the way they break into the context, separating vs. 23 and vs. 27, support the view that they did not stand in any common source.

Not only do both the Matthean and the Lukan forms of this discourse begin with the same Beatitudes, but they close with the same parable, Matt. 7:24–27=Luke 6:47–49. In this epilogue the sequence of thought is exactly the same, and the verbal likeness is far closer than at first sight appears:

Matt.: πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους.
Luke: πᾶς ὁ . . . . ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων.

[1] The last is especially clumsy. Who are the *you* and who the *their fathers?* A distinction is made in vs. 23 between the disciples and those who persecute them, but these woes cannot be addressed to the disciples, but must be regarded as spoken to the multitudes, and the distinction between *you* and *their fathers* then becomes awkward. The false disciples of Jas. 5:1 ff. are in the mind of the editor who added these verses. But this only confirms their secondary character.

Matt.: καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτοὺς ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ.
Luke: καὶ ποιῶν αὐτοὺς . . . . ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ.

Matt.: ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. . . . .
Luke: οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν . . . . ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.

Matt.: καὶ ἦλθαν οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ
Luke: πλημμύρης δὲ γενομένης προσέρηξεν ὁ ποταμός

Matt.: προσέπεσαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ . . . .
Luke: τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐλείνῃ, καὶ . . . .

Matt.: καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν
Luke: ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας

Matt.: αὐτοὺς, ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ μωρῷ ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν
Luke: ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομήσαντι

Matt.: αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον, etc.
Luke: οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν . . . . etc.

The common beginning and ending which we have found is a strong indication that some source, containing not mere fragmentary sayings but a real discourse, stood back of both the accounts, Matthew's and Luke's. This is confirmed by the relation of the whole discourse to the following narrative of the centurion's servant. The connection is not easily accounted for in any other

way. Luke 7:1 combines Matt. 7:28 and 8:5; and the cleansing of the leper, Matt. 8:1–1, is generally recognized as an insertion of Matthew from Mark. In this account of the centurion's servant, so closely connected in both Gospels with the preceding sermon, literary evidence again demonstrates the presence of a common source. It is hard to doubt that, wherever Matthew and Luke found this narrative of healing, they also found just before it a discourse of Jesus beginning with the Beatitudes and closing with the parable of the Two Builders.

Another important consideration is that throughout the common material the sequence is remarkably alike:

Matt. 5:3=Luke 6:20

(4=	21*b*)	7:1, 2=	37, 38
6=	21*a*	3=	41
11=	22	4, 5=	42
12=	23	(12=	31)
39=	29*a*	18=	43
40=	30	19=	44
(44=	27, 28)	22=	46
(45=	35*b*)	24=	47, 48*a*
46=	32	25=	48*b*
47=	33	26, 27=	49
48=	36		

Only four of the twenty-six verses of Matthew stand in a different order from the parallel verses of Luke. The first of these changes is merely the transposition of two sentences, readily explained by Matthew's additions to the Beatitudes. The other three are all related to one point in the discourse, and that point is just where Matthew returns to the Lukan material. Either the former has added or the latter has omitted; in either case the break in the common order is explained. Such a similarity through twenty-six verses cannot be accidental. The large amount of independent material scattered through Matt., chaps. 5, 6, 7, only makes it the more striking. We note also that there is here the same combination of close verbal resemblance with literary freedom which is usual in Markan material. Imbedded in the discourse as an integral part are 6:41, 42 of Luke and 7:3–5 of Matthew, where the identity of language demands a common source, written in Greek.[1] *τὸ κάρφος* and *ἡ δοκός* are found nowhere else in the New Testament; *διαβλέπω*, only in Mark 8:25; *κατανοεῖς* occurs nowhere else in

[1] See Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 44, 50.

Matthew; such an insertion of words between article and noun as τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκόν occurs only here in Matthew. ἄφες ἐκβάλω is a Semiticism, peculiar to the common material of Matthew and Luke. This close verbal likeness is not, indeed, maintained throughout, nor should the student of Mark and its parallels be surprised at this, but rather that the evangelists hold so closely to the wording of their source as they do in this non-Markan common material. The evidence becomes cumulative that Matthew and Luke preserve this other source far more carefully than they do Mark.

What, now, shall we say about the large portions of the Matthean Sermon on the Mount which Luke omits? As we remarked at the beginning, those sections which are paralleled by Luke in other contexts can hardly be original here. That he broke the sermon into fragments is too improbable to be supposed. Luke 5:25, 26; 5:31, 32; 6:9–14, 6:19–34; 7:7–11 are to be regarded as insertions into this context by Matthew. In 7:21–23 he combines the conception of Luke 6:46 ff., which refers to Jesus as a teacher, with Luke 13:23 ff., which is

eschatological and here out of place. Matt. 7:13, 14 seems to be related to the same Lukan passage.[1] The probability is also strong that Matthew has modified Luke 6:43–45 to give these verses a practical application to the church problem set forth in 7:15. In 12:33–35 he gives the same passage a different application. This tendency to apply Jesus' sayings to immediate needs is always to be reckoned with.[2] That 5:13–16 did not originally belong to the discourse has been sufficiently well shown by Wendt (*Die Lehre Jesu*, I), B. Weiss, and B. W. Bacon (*The Sermon on the Mount*). That 7:6 is an insertion is generally accepted.

The comparison of the teaching of Jesus with the Old Testament law in 5:17–38, and with Pharisaic practice in 6:1–8, 16–18, has by nearly all critics been regarded as an omission of Luke, on the ground that these sections were "inapplicable to the Gentiles for whom he wrote."[3] Such extended omissions are not without parallel in Luke's use of Mark; and his motives are frequently

[1] This passage is discussed more fully on pp. 96 ff.

[2] See further, pp. 61 f.

[3] Votaw, in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, V, 7.

difficult to determine. This should be granted, but to maintain that these verses were inapplicable to the Gentiles is hardly a satisfactory explanation of their omission here. Only Matt. 5:18, 19 could be so regarded, but their originality in this context is widely disputed, and 5:18 is in fact preserved by Luke in a different context. B. W. Bacon, while arguing for the omission, makes this acknowledgment:[1]

> It was, indeed, from the standpoint of the historian of Jesus' life and teaching, a disastrous, *almost incredible*, mutilation to leave out, as our third evangelist has done, all the negative side of the teaching and give nothing but the commandment of ministering love toward all. We *can scarcely understand* that the five great interpretative antitheses of the new law of conduct toward men versus the old, Matt. 5:21–48, and the three corresponding antitheses on duty toward God, Matt. 6:1–18, *could have been dropped* in one form even of the oral tradition.

If this is so, ought not some more credible hypothesis be sought? What no one form of the tradition would drop, a separate tradition might preserve. May it not be that Matthew has added from independent sources, rather than that Luke

[1] *Sermon on the Mount*, p. 104. The italics are mine.

has omitted? All the elements of Matthew's discourse are of prime historical importance, but the whole is manifestly a composite. These antitheses are among the great sayings of Jesus, but do they not belong by themselves? They have their own introduction in 5:17 (18, 19), 20, quite distinct from the Beatitudes, and they are complete in themselves. Wellhausen[1] has called attention to the fact that just where Matthew takes up the material of the Lukan discourse, in 5:38, the formula of 5:21 ff. becomes improbable. The *lex talionis*, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, is given in the Old Testament as a rule for judges, not as a principle of general conduct; and so to use it is not exactly fair to Judaism. The viewpoint also seems to shift a little. In this case it is not a standard of inner motives set over against one of external acts, as in the previous antitheses. The same objections apply with even more force to 5:43, against which modern Jews have long protested. No such principle is set forth in the Old Testament, nor anywhere else in Jewish literature. The Jews never taught such hatred except toward

[1] *Kom. Matt., in loc.*

national and religious foes. There is, therefore, good reason to think that 5:38 and 5:43 are editorial additions by which the separate speeches are woven into one whole. Matt. 5:17 (18, 19), 20–24, 27, 28 (29, 30), 33–37; 6:1–8, 16–18 thus becomes a separate discourse, three antitheses of the old and the new law and three antitheses of principles of conduct.

Our conclusion, based on the strong linguistic evidence of a common source, the common sequence, the close organic relation to the material that follows, and the evidence of compilation on Matthew's part is that both evangelists are here using a common source, Q. The exact wording of Q can, of course, never be restored. Judging again from the analogy of Mark, we can only say that these versions give us approximately what stood in the source. Matthew, whom we expect to hold closer in details to his source, has so woven material together that more changes here are necessary. Then, too, there is a poetical parallelism, especially marked in the Lukan form, which, if we may not attribute it to Jesus himself, is certainly more likely to come from a Semitic source than from its

Greek editor. It is, as we shall see, one of the characteristics of Q.

Without, therefore, attempting to restore the original text we may still venture to suggest probable changes made by the evangelists. If in the Beatitudes Matthew has converted conditions of life into virtues and added others (probably from independent tradition, though their close relation to the Old Testament makes this doubtful), Luke has at least accentuated his interpretation of the Beatitudes as a promise of a reversal in the kingdom of present human conditions by the addition of *νῦν* (*bis*) and *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*.[1] Whether the Son of Man or the personal pronoun is original in the Beatitudes cannot be determined. The term "Son of Man" is found throughout Q.

In Matt. 5:38–48 = Luke 6:27–36 the change in order is due to Matthew's combination of this section with 5:13–37. Luke 6:29, 30 = Matt. 5:39–42

[1] Wellhausen's explanation of the difference between *τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν* and *οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν* as due to a reading of *daqdamaihon* for *daqdamaikon* is one of the most tempting of such suggestions that have been made. But there is good reason for thinking that *τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν* is simply an addition of Matthew. See Harnack, p. 50.

are separated from the rest to form a contrast with the Old Testament principle of Matt. 5:38; and Luke 5:35*b* = Matt. 5:45 is inserted at the point of omission to make a suitable transition. The transference of the Golden Rule, Luke 6:31, to Matt. 7:12 is because Matthew regards it as a summary of the law, and the whole sermon is to him a discourse on the new law fulfilling the Old Testament law; he therefore places this summary just before the conclusion of the whole. "For this is the law and the prophets" is his addition and shows his standpoint.

Luke seems to have generalized Matt. 5:45, converting the concrete illustration "for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" to the general statement "for he is kind toward the unthankful and evil." Matt. 5:41 may be a further illustration which the first evangelist has added from popular tradition or it may have stood in Q and been omitted by Luke.[1] Luke's figure of a robbery in vs. 29 seems simpler and more original than

[1] *Did.* 1:3 ff., which in general is closer to Luke, includes this saying.

Matthew's form of a lawsuit in vs. 40. Luke's additions in vs. 27*b* are supported by the early Fathers, *Did.* 1:3 ff.; Just., *Ap.* 1:15; *Didask.* 5:15, but, like the expansion in vss. 33 ff., are more likely to be Lukan interpretations. *οἱ ἁμαρτωλοῖ* is a characteristic Lukan term; if either evangelist has preserved the word of Q, it is Matthew. But *τέλειος*, Matt., vs. 48, reflects later doctrinal views, and *οἰκτίρμων*, Luke, vs. 36, is probably from the original source. This word, not found elsewhere in Luke, fits the context much better than *τέλειος*. The mercifulness of God is also a divine attribute frequently emphasized in the Old Testament, and *οἰκτίρμων* is the LXX translation of *reḥum*, a word applied regularly to God.

In Matt. 7:1–5 = Luke 5:37–42 it is more likely that the text of Luke has been expanded. The two commonplace proverbs, vss. 39, 40, are found in Matthew in quite different contexts, 15:14, 10:25. It is doubtful whether there is any literary connection in this case.[1] Vs. 38 also, as Wellhausen has suggested, seems overfull. Probable as it is

[1] These verses are discussed more fully on p. 107.

that we have additions in these verses, it is doubtful whether they were made by the third evangelist himself. They may have been added previously. In Matt. 7:16–20; Luke 6:43–45, however, it is Matthew who has changed and applied the saying to the false and true prophets of 7:15.[1] Between the two forms of the concluding parables one cannot decide, but Luke's text is more easily explained on the basis of Matthew's than vice versa. Both evangelists have probably made some changes. Matthew has expanded 7:28, 29 by adding the idea of Mark 1:22, which he omitted in its Markan connection.

Most difficult of all is the task of determining what introduction this discourse had in Q. Matthew places the discourse near the beginning of the ministry, but introduces the mountain and the multitudes of Mark 3:7–12. Jesus is described as being on the mountain with his disciples. They are addressed, but the people are down below within hearing. As has often been noticed, the parallel to Moses' giving the law on Mount Sinai is striking. In Luke the discourse is directed to

[1] For the relation of Matt. 7:21 to Luke 6:46 see pp. 96 ff.

the disciples, 6:20, but the presence of the multitude is affirmed in 6:17–19; 6:27 (?); 7:1. Jesus is not upon the mountain, but has just come down. It is probable that in Q the disciples were addressed, but it is evident that a much larger company than the Twelve was intended. Both Matthew and Luke sought to give the discourse as large an audience as possible and hence used Mark 3:7–12, but in their own individual ways. If some reference to mountain or hill country also stood in Q, it would still further explain this common use of Mark 3:7–12.

SECTION 4. COMMENDATION OF A CENTURION'S FAITH, LUKE 7:1–10; MATT. 8:5–10, 13

It has already been pointed out that Luke's introduction here, 7:1, combines Matthew's conclusion to the Sermon on the Mount with his introduction to this incident, and that therefore the account of the centurion stood in this same connection in Q. The verbal agreement of Matt. 8:8–10=Luke 7:6*b*–9 necessitates the assumption of a common Greek source here. This verbal agreement includes several striking phrases. The

ἱκανὸς ἵνα of Matt. 8:8=Luke 7:6 is mentioned by Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, p. 50. εἰπὲ λόγῳ, Matt. 8:8=Luke 7:7, should also be noted. It occurs only here in the New Testament. Although the two accounts agree so closely in the conversation reported, the preceding narrative is given in very different forms. Matthew's form is more condensed and simpler, but not necessarily more original. That a gentile centurion should send Jewish elders to Jesus is most natural; nor is it strange that he should remain by the bedside instead of coming out himself. Nor again is it absurd that the friends should give his message in his own words; it would only be so if Jesus answered them as if addressing him, but this he does not. There is a respect here for Jewish prejudices which seems primitive. Nothing distinctively Lukan can be found in the standpoint of these additions, nor is there any indication that they were added to magnify the miracle. The theory of an assimilation of this narrative to Mark 5:21–43 does not commend itself. Moreover, Matthew's tendency to condense pure narration is established by his use of Mark. It is

possible, therefore, that Luke is closer to Q despite the nearly unanimous verdict of the critics in favor of Matthew. On a priori grounds we should hardly expect the longer narrative to belong to that source, and it may be that Luke has supplemented Q with information from other sources.

Matt. 8:11, 12 is an insertion of that evangelist.[1] Most of the linguistic differences seem due to Luke's literary changes. Luke 7:1*a* is a Lukan paraphrase for Matt. 7:28*a*. Ἐπειδή, ἐπλήρωσεν, ῥήματα, εἰς τὰς ἀκοάς are all characteristic of Luke. Matthew is also truer to Q in retaining the term παῖς throughout, but Luke has probably given this word its true interpretation. The Hebrew equivalent *naʿar* (Aram. *talya*) has the same ambiguity which παῖς has. In Luke 7:2*b* ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν, ὃς ἦν αὐτῷ ἔντιμος are, perhaps, additions of Luke; so also ὄχλῳ in 7:9. Luke 7:3–6*a* contains several Lukan characteristics. These do not necessarily mean that the verses are a composition of Luke, but they show that he has not preserved his source without, at least, verbal changes. Matt. 8:13

[1] See pp. 96 ff.

might seem to be more original than Luke 7:10 if we did not find that he changes the text of Mark 7:19, 30 in the same way.[1]

SECTION 5. DISCOURSE ON JOHN THE BAPTIST, LUKE 7:18–35; MATT. 11:2–19

Matt. 11:3*b*–11, 16–19 and Luke 7:19*b*, 22–28, 31–35 are practically identical in language. Only the slightest changes have been made by the editors. More convincing evidence of a common Greek source cannot be asked for. Our only task is to point out such editorial changes as seem probable. The introductions, Matt. 11:2, 3 = Luke 7:18–20, show the usual variations. But there must have stood in the source some reference to John's sending his disciples to Jesus. The question they ask is John's question, not theirs, Matt. 11:4 = Luke 7:22. Luke 7:21 is certainly an addition of Luke to prepare for the answer of Jesus, 7:22. In Matt. 11:4–10 = Luke 7:22–27 the differences are insignificant. Matthew is probably more

[1] This argument would naturally have no force for those who regard Matthew as more original in 15:21–28. Harnack may be right in affirming that neither verse stood in Q. The interest to Q is not in the miracle, but in the saying of Jesus. See p. 210.

original than Luke in 11:8*b*, but Luke gives the true position of ἰδεῖν in 7:25, 26. The Semitic original has not the double meaning of the Greek τί. It was, therefore, the Greek text of the source which Matthew has interpreted differently from Luke. In Luke 7:28 προφήτης is either an insertion of Luke, softening the bold assertion, or a gloss.[1] Both evangelists have made additions after Matt. 11:11=Luke 7:28. Matthew adds vss. 12–15 qualifying the previous statement that John does not belong to the kingdom. The insertion by Matthew of vss. 12, 13 is thus explicable, but that Luke should have omitted this clause here to insert it in 16:16 is hard to believe. Matt. 11:14 might have been omitted by Luke for the same reason that he leaves out Mark 9:9–13. But if vss. 12, 13 are an insertion of Matthew, vs. 14 probably is one also. Luke, likewise, has added vss. 29, 30 to form a better transition to the parable which follows. But the contrast in these verses between the publicans on the one hand and the

[1] The position in which D places 7:28*a* is attractive, but has not sufficient textual support. προφήτης is omitted from B, ℵ, and other manuscripts.

Pharisees and the scribes on the other is not the point of the parable. In the parable itself the Semitic parallelism is better preserved in Luke than in Matthew. But Luke has probably changed ἐκόψασθε to ἐκλαύσατε; and ἄρτον, οἶνον, πάντων are either glosses or additions of Luke. It is Matthew, however, and not Luke, who has changed τέκνων to ἔργων. In the section just after this Matthew puts the woes upon the cities which do not recognize the "works" of Jesus. τὰ ἔργα is likewise introduced by Matthew at the beginning of this section, 11:2. Lagarde's theory that this variation is due to a misreading of the Hebrew original, Wellhausen has shown to be impossible.[1]

SECTION 6. FOLLOWING JESUS, LUKE 9:57–62; MATT. 8:19–22

In this section the verbal likeness throughout is such that no one can question the presence of a common Greek source. Matthew has sought to define the τις of Luke 9:57 more closely as a scribe; διδάσκαλε also is more likely to have been

[1] See Matthew, *in loc.*

added than omitted. It is hard to decide which Gospel gives the saying in regard to the second follower in the primitive form. In Luke vss. 59, 60 are a counterpart to vss. 57, 58, and the development of thought is clearer. The change, if made by Matthew, can be accounted for by the situation in which Matthew puts these sayings. They are a test of those who would follow Jesus as he is about to cross the lake. In this connection Luke 9:60*b* is out of place and the adaptation of Matthew is understood. This emphasis on preaching the kingdom belongs to Q, not Luke; in the section which followed in Q it is twice referred to.[1] Even more difficult is the question whether or not Luke 9:61, 62 are added by Luke or omitted by Matthew. As has been said, the sayings of vss. 57, 58 and of vss. 59, 60 are counterparts, complete in themselves. The point of what is said to the third would-be follower is nearly the same as that of what is said to the second. But this is hardly sufficient ground for regarding it as an addition. Matthew's context favored condensation. εὐέθετος is found elsewhere only in Luke 14:35, and

[1] See Luke 10:9, 11; Matt. 10:7.

ἀποτάξεσθαι is found in Luke 14:33,[1] another passage on the conditions of discipleship probably belonging to Q.[2] If this is an addition it is a very old one.

SECTION 7. COMMISSION TO THE DISCIPLES, LUKE 10:1–12; MATT. 9:35—10:16

In this section, as in the Sermon on the Mount, problems are created by the conflation which Matthew has made, this time with the parallel account in Mark. Matt. 9:35 is a repetition of 4:23 = Mark 1:39. Matt. 9:36 reflects Mark 6:34. With Matt. 9:37 the first evangelist takes up the Q account, and the fact that he puts 10:1 = Mark 6:7 after 9:37, 38 = Luke 10:2, where it is entirely out of place, is conclusive evidence that he is here combining his two sources. With 10:5, 6 Matthew returns again to Q. This can be regarded as certain, even though these verses are omitted by Luke; the wonder is that even Matthew has retained this prohibition against going among the heathen or Samaritans. Matt. 10:7*a* is from Luke 10:9*b*. Matt. 10:8 is an editorial addition of Matthew on

[1] Elsewhere only in Mark 6:46; Acts 18:18, 21; II Cor. 2:13.

[2] See pp. 174 f.

the basis of Jesus' words to John the Baptist in 11:5.[1] Matt., 10:9, 10 combine features of both sources and show an adaptation to later church problems. Matt. 10:11 is from Mark 6:10, but "search out who in it is worthy" is added to meet a later church problem. Matt. 10:12, 13 is from Luke 10:5, 6; 10:14 from Mark 6:11; 10:15 from Luke 10:12; 10:16*a* from Luke 10:3. Matt. 10:16*b* is not found in Luke but it is very possible that Luke objected to this comparison of disciples to serpents and therefore omitted it.

Turning now to Luke's account of the commission to the disciples, we would regard 10:1 as redactional, adapting this section to the situation of 9:51 ff. The number "seventy" probably replaces the usual "disciples" of Q. Luke may have found it already added to his source or adopted it from oral tradition. We have already referred to Luke's omission of the prohibition against working among heathen and Samaritans. Its form and position in Matthew would indicate that it followed Luke 10:2. Of the original position of

[1] J. Weiss in *Die Schriften des N.T., in loc.*, has well presented the secondary character of Matthew throughout this section.

Luke 10:3 we cannot be sure, for it may have been inserted where it is in place of the passage omitted by Luke. The verse is abrupt where it stands, but after Matt. 10:6 it would be impossible. No place for this verse would be more appropriate than at the end of the next section, Luke 10:16. Matthew would then have retained it in its original relative position as an introduction to the warnings which he adds here, but have omitted the intervening woes to be used elsewhere, 11:20 ff. However, we can only conjecture where this originally stood. Luke 10:8*b* reads like a later addition, having in mind the same church problem which Paul encounters, I Cor. 10:27. With these exceptions Luke no doubt gives us the thought, if not the exact language, of Q.

Our analysis makes it clear that we are not dealing merely with two or three stray verses which Matthew and Luke have in common, but with a connected discourse which both use, Matthew weaving all characteristic passages into Mark, Luke placing the whole side by side with Mark (9:1 ff. = Mark 10:1 ff. = Q). Under these circumstances we should not be surprised if verbal

resemblances were wanting, but they are not entirely. Matt. 9:37, 38=Luke 10:2, where the verb ἐκβάλλω for sending reapers into the harvest points to an awkward but accurate Greek translation of an Aramaic *appeq;*[1] and Matt. 10:15=Luke 10:12. ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως is a characteristic of Matthew. Matt. 10:16*a* is also identical with Luke 10:3, with the one change of ἄρνος to πρόβατα (or vice versa?). The common use here of ἐν with the dative μέσῳ after a verb of motion is probably a Semiticism. Therefore, despite the changes which have been made in the editorial use of this material, we can with all confidence assign the section to the common Greek source, Q.

SECTION 8. WOES ON THE CITIES WHICH FAIL TO RESPOND, LUKE 10:13–16; MATT. 11:20–24

Even in Matthew, who has inserted other material between, it is evident that this section is a continuation of the last, for he has repeated the introductory sentence of Luke, Luke 10:12=Matt. 11:24.[2] The verbal resemblance here is a conclusive reason for thinking that this stood in Q.

[1] Wellhausen, *in loc.* [2] For further evidence see p. 125.

Matt. 11:21–23*a* = Luke 10:13–15. If Luke gives this section in its original context, then 11:20 and 11:23*b* were added by Matthew in suiting it to a different setting. Luke 10:16 closes the discourse to the disciples; and is original, for the same idea is used by Matthew in his concluding verses, 10:40 ff. But Matthew has preferred the form of this saying which he found in Mark 9:37 and which better suited his purpose.

SECTION 9. RETURN OF THE DISCIPLES, LUKE 10:17–20

This section is not found in Matthew and must be considered with the independent material of Luke. See p. 166.

SECTION 10. JESUS' SELF-REVELATION TO HIS DISCIPLES, LUKE 10:21, 22; MATT. 11:25–27

In this section it is only necessary to refer to the close verbal identity which proves that it belongs to Q. Whether the introductory clause of Luke 10:21*a* goes back to his source is questionable. The emphasis on the Holy Spirit sounds Lukan, and Luke is prone to add such clauses. The simple,

colorless sentence of Matt. 11:25*a* may be all that stood in Q. Harnack, pp. 272 ff., following the suggestion of Wellhausen, argues at length to show that *καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ* was not in Q. It is possible that it is an insertion; but the evidence is not convincing.

SECTION 11. THE PROPHETS' DESIRE FOR WHAT THE DISCIPLES HAVE SEEN, LUKE 10:23–24; MATT. 13:16, 17

The principal question in this short section concerns its original position.[1] The verbal likeness here is close. Luke has added a characteristic introductory clause, but Matthew has changed *βασιλεῖς* to *δίκαιοι*.

SECTION 12. PRAYER, PROMISE TO THE DISCIPLES OF DIVINE HELP, LUKE 11:1–13; MATT. 6:9–15; 7:7–11

In Luke 11:1–4; Matt. 6:9–13 one is more impressed with the differences between the Gospels than with their likenesses. This could be explained on the ground that either one or both evangelists might naturally give this prayer in the form which

[1] See p. 126.

was known and used in his community. But the stylistic changes of Luke show that he is using some source rather than a formal community prayer.[1] The use by both evangelists of the unintelligible word ἐπιούσιον can also be best explained as coming from a common source. Moreover, Matthew contains the same petitions as Luke in the same order; the principal difference is that Matthew's account is much fuller. English and American scholars have as a rule maintained the greater originality of the Matthean form. Votaw's article on "The Sermon on the Mount" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. V, is representative. But, surely, the historical probability points the other way. "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven" is only a further definition of "Thy kingdom come." So also "Deliver us from evil" only states in a positive form what "Lead us not into temptation" expresses negatively. These clauses amplify, but they add no new element of thought; nor do they contain anything distinctively Jewish which Gentiles would have any reason to omit. The very reverse is

[1] See Harnack, p. 64.

nearer the truth. Both petitions are to be explained as interpretative additions due to liturgical use, and not as Lukan omissions. "Our Father who art in heaven," a characteristic term of later rabbinic literature, is found only in one passage of the New Testament outside of Matthew, and that passage is regarded by some as due to Mark's influence, Mark 11:25, 26.[1] The fact that the term is peculiar to Matthew throws doubt on its use by Jesus. The case is especially strong against its use here. Granting that Jesus might have employed either expression, the fact remains that in his own prayers he said only "Abba, Father." On this point the testimony of Matthew agrees with that of Mark, Luke, and John. Rom. 8:14, 15; Gal. 4:6; I Pet. 1:17 indicate that he taught his disciples when they prayed to address God in the same simple way.

On the other hand, the Lukan form of this prayer also shows indications of editorial change. *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν* is found only in Luke 19:47; Acts 17:4

[1] Luke's use of *πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* in 11:13 would seem to show that he was unfamiliar with the Matthean title rather than that he objected to it. Gentile influence cannot account for the disappearance of this title outside of Matthew.

and may be an interpretation of that evangelist. Luke 11:4 seems to have been changed by Luke for literary reasons. Matt. 6:12 is recognized by all as more primitive. The striking term ὀφειλήματα of vs. 12 is changed to παραπτώματα in vss. 14 and 15. In these verses Matthew is probably appending material from another source. In Luke's introduction the first clause at least, "It came to pass while he was in a certain place praying, when he stopped," has all the earmarks of Lukan editorship, and introductions we know were always the most subject to change. The request from the disciples, however, may well have been in the source, for it is there that we find such a strong interest in John the Baptist.[1] Harnack has connected the reference to the Baptist here with the Marcion reading of Luke 11:2, which he, as well as Wellhausen, regards as the original text of Luke. Such a connection would indicate that the whole introduction is editorial, but the textual evidence for this reading of Luke 11:2 is altogether insufficient. In the only three witnesses which we have, the position wavers. Marcion reads, "Let thy Holy Spirit

[1] Note Secs. 1 and 5.

come upon us and purify us," instead of the first petition. Gregory of Nyssa and Cod. 700 evv. read it in place of the second.[1] Surely the simplest explanation of this petition is that, like the Matthean prediction, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," it is another interpretation of the older, more Jewish, "Thy kingdom come." It is true that this interpretation is consistent with many other changes made by Luke. But this does not justify one in attributing every reference to the Holy Spirit to that evangelist without more trustworthy witnesses. There is of course no question about this reading having stood in Q. Q must have had "Thy kingdom come."

Parables such as Luke 11:5–8, which are not testified to by Matthew, need to be considered in connection with the special material of Luke. See p. 167.

In Matt. 7:7–11 = Luke 11:9–13 we have again that close verbal relationship which we have learned to expect in a large portion of this material. It includes the word ἐπιδώσει, found nowhere else in Matthew, and δόματα, which is a common word in

[1] See Ropes, *Agrapha*, p. 57. Gregory is followed by Maximus.

the LXX but nowhere else in the Gospels or Acts. Our greatest difficulty is in the relation of Luke 11:11, 12 to Matt. 7:9, 10. The textual evidence gives a strong probability to the claim that in Luke 11:11 ἄρτον . . . . ἢ καὶ is a later harmonistic insertion; and that, therefore, Luke contained originally only the reference to the fish and the egg, while Matthew had the bread and the fish. Either might have stood in Q, but the fact that stones have already been used in this same figurative way twice in Q[1] favors the Matthean form. Luke may have thought that to give a scorpion instead of an egg was much more forceful than stones for bread. In Luke 11:13 πνεῦμα ἅγιον has been substituted for ἀγαθά. Harnack has argued that this supports the Marcion reading of 11:2, but, as Wellhausen suggests, intead of being a proof it may have been the occasion for the change in 11:2.

SECTION 13. CALUMNY OF THE PHARISEES, LUKE 11:14–23; MATT 12:22–32

In this section we have an excellent example of Matthew's method of compilation. No very

[1] Matt. 3:9; 4:3; this latter is a close parallel.

critical examination is necessary to see that Matthew here combines Mark 3:22 ff. with Luke 11:14 ff. Passing over the introduction for the present, Matt. 12:25*b*, 26*a*, 29, 31 (32) are certainly from Mark. Verses 31, 32 are found in an entirely different connection in Luke. There can be no question that Luke 12:10 gives the original setting of this saying in Q. That Matthew should have placed it here is explained by its occurrence here in Mark; but why Luke should omit it here and put it in a different context, if it stood here in Q, is inexplicable. Matthew has been influenced by the form of this saying in Q, as a comparison readily shows. Matt. 12:21, 32 combines Q and Mark.

Matt. 12:24*b*, 25*a*, 25*b*–28, 30 are taken from Luke's source. In Matt. 12:26*b*–28, 30, the two accounts are almost word for word the same. Matthew has this time even accepted the term "kingdom of God." That both employed the preposition ἐν throughout for the instrument in accordance with Semitic usage is noteworthy.[1] σκορπίζει

[1] See J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Prolegomena, p. 104.

is found nowhere else in the Synoptics or Acts. The only difference between the two Gospels is in the substitution of πνεύματι by Matthew for δακτύλῳ. This substitution was probably caused by the introduction from Mark of the sin against the Holy Spirit.

In both the introduction and the conclusion of this section in Matthew a phenomenon occurs which calls for further explanation. Matthew contains two passages referring to a dumb man and the charge, "By the prince of demons he casteth forth demons," 9:32–34; 12:22–24. The passage in chap. 9 is closer to the Lukan parallel of 12:22–24 than is the reference in this immediate connection. In like manner Matthew's conclusion, 12:33–35, is parallel to Matt. 7:16–20 of the Sermon on the Mount; and here, the second time, it is the passage that has a different context which is nearest to the Lukan form of the same saying. Attention ought to be called to the fact that this is no uncommon occurrence in Matthew. For instance, Mark 3:7–12 is used with great freedom in Matt. 12:15–21, but in Matt. 4:23–25 it is closely followed. Clearly

in this case only the one source is used. Just so in the introduction to the sending out of the Twelve, Matthew has repeated what he had in 4:23=Mark 1:39; and anticipated Mark 6:34, which is given with greater freedom again in its Markan context, 14:14. Nor can we doubt that he has done the same thing in 10:40, anticipating Mark 9:37, which he there, 18:5=Mark 9:37, repeats. Matt. 5:29, 30=18:8, 9=Mark 9:43 ff. is a similar case. There is slight ground for assigning 5:29, 30 to Q; if Luke found this in both Mark and Q he would not have omitted it. Again, Mark 13:9*b*–13 is anticipated in Matt. 10:17–22 (23?) and repeated freely in 24:9–14, though here there is better ground for arguing that Matthew had access to some source of Mark. What, now, is the most natural explanation of such passages? They point first of all to Matthew's great familiarity with his sources.[1] He knows them thoroughly and uses them as a master. Again, they emphasize that Matthew's great concern is to make each of

[1] J. V. Bartlett in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. "Matthew," says: "Our Matthew was so familiar with the latter [Mark] as to combine his phrases in memory without a full sense of their actual position in Mark's narrative."

his main sections as complete as possible; he is not at all afraid of duplication. Duplicates, therefore, in Matthew do not *necessarily* mean two sources.

In Matthew's section on miracles he needed the healing of a dumb man in anticipation of 11:1 ff. He remembers that which Q gives in connection with the Beelzebul incident,[1] and when he comes to relate the Beelzebul incident itself the same healing is repeated but with some features of the incident, with which he joined it in chap. 9, added. These are added for the purpose of contrasting the correct estimate of Jesus by the people to this judgment of the Pharisees. Matthew is always interested in showing that Jesus' condemnations are restricted to the scribes and Pharisees.

Is not the same true of Matthew's conclusion, 12:33–37? Surely we cannot say that Matthew has two sources, for it is 12:33–37 and not 7:16 ff. which shows the closest literary relationship to Luke, and a comparison of the two Matthean

[1] Not the healing of Mark 7:31–37, to which 9:32–34 has not the slightest resemblance. So also 9:27–31 is more closely related to Mark 10:46–52 than to Mark 8:22 ff.

passages reveals an adaptation to different contexts rather than the use of two sources. Both Matthew and Luke include this parable in the Sermon on the Mount, while only Matthew gives it here. The natural conclusion must be that in common source it belonged to that sermon. Jülicher[1] argues that only Luke 6:44=Matt. 7:17 stood in the Sermon on the Mount, and that both evangelists independently add to the source portions of another anti-pharisaic speech, which Matthew gives a second time in chap. 12. A mere statement of this theory shows its improbability. Jülicher's reason for this view is that he does not find the close logical connection in the Sermon on the Mount between 6:45 and 6:46 ff., which he regards as necessary. But have we not as close a development of thought as can be asked for? In Matt. 7:1–5=Luke 6:37–42[2] a warning is given, first, in regard to judging others; second, showing the need of examining one's own conduct. Then follows this parable

[1] *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, p. 127.

[2] Here the shorter form of Matthew is preferable; see p. 38.

of the Tree and Its Fruit, emphasizing how all conduct, which naturally includes speech, is an expression of the inner life of the man. In 6:45 attention is especially called to speech as revealing the heart or inner life. This is succeeded by a warning to those who merely make professions without taking hold of Jesus' teachings with all their hearts, 6:46 ff. Moreover, even if we did not find a satisfactory succession of ideas here, this would not prove that the author of Q did not. Jülicher acknowledges that Matt., chap. 12, offers only a doubtful connection, and he has not shown that the form of the parable in chap. 12 is at all superior to that of Luke. Luke 6:43 is certainly more original than Matt. 12:33. Jülicher's objection to Luke 6:44*b* is hypercritical. In 6:45, however, the αὐτοῦ at the end is an awkward addition which Matthew is correct in omitting. Matt. 12:34*a*, 36, 37 are editorial additions of that evangelist. Our conclusion, therefore, is that here, as in the previous instances we have quoted, Matthew has used the same material twice.

Luke seems to have held very closely to his source in this section. Even vs. 16 can hardly have

been added here by Luke. As Wendt argues, no later editor would have inserted it so long before the incident which it introduces. The Beelzebul charge and the demand for signs were already associated in Q, and to Q vs. 16 must be assigned. Matthew this time does not help us much in determining stylistic changes of Luke. It is possible that Matt. 9:33*b* preserves a clause omitted by Luke.

SECTION 14. THE SEVEN OTHER SPIRITS, LUKE 11:24–26; MATT 12:43–45

The close verbal identity here from beginning to end leaves no question about this section except its position in Q, which will be discussed later. Whether *σχολάζοντα* was added by Matthew or omitted by Luke cannot be decided. If, as good reason will be shown for believing, the position given to this section by Luke is original, then Matt., vs. 45*b*, is an editorial addition.[1] Luke 11: 27, 28 will be considered with all such material peculiar to Luke. See pp. 167 f.

[1] See further Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, p. 237.

SECTION 15. THE DEMAND FOR A SIGN FROM HEAVEN, LUKE 11:29–36; MATT. 12:38–42

In this section also we find the usual close verbal resemblance throughout, but here there are a few differences which attract our attention. Neither the introduction of Matthew nor that of Luke is to be regarded as original. Matthew, as usual, makes this a demand of the scribes and Pharisees. Luke introduces the crowds in his characteristic manner. Probably in Q this section followed immediately upon the preceding with no further introduction beyond what was given in Luke 11:16. Luke has omitted the *μοιχαλίς* of Matt., vs. 39, as we should expect him to do. *τοῦ προφήτου* is more likely added by Matthew. It is generally agreed that vs. 40 is a later insertion of Matthew. Wellhausen, who stands almost alone among liberal critics in supporting it, seems in this case at least to be influenced by his prejudice against the source, Q. While the preaching of Jonah is not a sign in the sense meant by Jesus' interrogators, it was a sign which the Ninevites heeded and one which exactly suited the occasion here. Mark and Q are in full harmony. Exactly

the same truth is taught in Luke 12:54–56.[1] On the other hand, Luke, who is concerned with a proper historical sequence, has placed Matt., vs. 42, before vs. 41. There is not sufficient textual evidence for omitting vs. 32 from Luke's text.

The appendix which Luke adds here, 11:33–36, is one of the most puzzling sections in all the Gospels; the worst difficulty is that we cannot know what the true text of Luke is. As it stands in *Textus Receptus*, vs. 36 is unintelligible. A comparison with other MSS tends to show that our perplexity is caused by a process of harmonization of this with the other similar passages, Mark 4:21, Matt. 5:15, and especially Matt. 6:22, 23. The most thorough investigation of these passages has been made by Jülicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, II, 98 ff.). He concludes that Luke originally read vss. 33, 34*a*, 36 (in the form of S^s)[2] succeeded probably by vs. 35. He thinks that vs. 34*b* was inserted here from Matt. 6:22, 23 and

[1] See pp. 90 ff.

[2] Mrs. Lewis translates S^s: "Therefore also thy body, when there is in it no lamp that shines, is dark; thus while thy lamp is shining it gives light to thee." This reading is also found in the old Latin MSS *f*, *q*.

caused the present confusion of the text. But the same line of reasoning which he follows favors the probability that vs. 33 likewise has slipped from the margin into the text. Just as the insertion of vs. 34*b* preceded all our MSS authorities, so may that of vs. 33. As a marginal note it is intelligible, as an integral part of the text it is most difficult. Omitting it, the connection between vss. 32 and 34 is evident. It is improbable that the verse stood in this connection originally in Q. But by whom was it added? The likeness of vs. 33 to Matt. 5:15 disappears when ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον is recognized as a harmonistic redaction. But its close relation to Luke 8:16 is too striking to be accidental. εἰς κρύπτην for the concrete κλίνης of Luke 8:16 indicates that this is the secondary form. Luke 8:16, itself, is clearly dependent on Mark 4:21. The differences are explained by Mark's clumsy Greek. It is possible that the evangelist himself has introduced this saying in 11:33, but such additions resting on mere verbal resemblances are quite foreign to his editorial work, and it therefore seems more likely that, like vs. 34*b*, it has slipped from the margin into the text.

However that may be, it ought not to be ascribed to Q. After its omission the connection of vss. 32 and 34 appears; the people called for a sign; what they needed was an inner light with which to see.[1] The change from the third to the second person is not surprising. These verses lead naturally to the theme of Luke 11:37 ff. That whole section sets forth the principle of vs. 35. And this is the more significant because Luke's insertion of 11:37, 38[2] would indicate that he failed to see the close relation and so made a new beginning. Surely it is possible that vss. 34*a*, 36 (in the form of S^s), 35 did follow vs. 32 in Q, and that Matthew has omitted them because they failed to mean anything to him in this connection and he had already twice used the figure of the lamp. Where the text is so obscure we can do little more than suggest possibilities. If Jülicher is correct in his textual restoration of Luke here, then little reason remains for finding any literary relation between Matt. 6:32, 23 and Luke 11:33–36. But if the *Textus Receptus* is retained and the unintelligible vs. 36 be omitted as hopelessly corrupt, then either Matthew or Luke

[1] Cf. Luke 12:54–56.

[2] See below, pp. 75 f.

has changed the original position of the saying.[1] Whichever form is retained, the thought in this context is appropriate.

SECTION 16. WOES ON THE PHARISEES, THE SCRIBES, AND THIS ADULTEROUS GENERATION, LUKE 11:37–54; MATT., CHAP. 23

This section belongs really in a class by itself. The confidence with which we have been able to assign all previous sections to Q here must give way to mere probability. The problems are similar to those in the Sermon on the Mount, but much more difficult of solution. What evidence have we that we are dealing here with a common source?

In the first place, all of Luke except the setting is paralleled in Matthew, but the divergence is more than usual and the order quite different. Matt. 23:4 closely resembles Luke 11:46 in thought, but the language of the two accounts is not at all alike. Much can be said for the view that we have here two different translations of the same original. They might even be independent of each other. The differences, however, may be

[1] See further, p. 86.

explained as due to Luke's stylistic changes. His text is much smoother Greek, while one phrase of Matthew is very crude, δεσμεύω φορτία. It is consistent with this that some of the vigor of Matthew is lost in Luke, as the force of the contrast between shoulder and finger.

Matt. 23:6 not only resembles Luke 11:43 in thought but in language as well. This condemnation is found in Mark 12:38, 39 also, but the fact that Matthew and Luke agree here against Mark suggests the possibility of another source. This coincident variation is the more important because, while Luke 20:46 agrees with Mark, Luke 11:43 agrees with Matthew against Mark. Nor is it at all like Luke to insert this woe here from Mark and then repeat it in the Markan connection. The possibility at least suggests itself that Matthew and Luke are here dependent on a non-Markan common source and that Matthew has simply added τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις from Mark.

Matt. 23:13 and Luke 11:52 seem to go back to a common original. γνώσεως is certainly a later substitute for the βασιλείαν of Matthew. This is shown by εἰσήλθατε which follows. The fact that

the only other occurrence of γνῶσις in the Gospels is in Luke 1:77[1] may indicate that the change was made by him.

In Luke 11:42=Matt. 23:23 the only clear indication of literary dependence is in the last clause, but this seems due to later harmonistic influence. D omits it in the text of Luke. The clause is probably an insertion of Matthew, showing, as it does, the same standpoint as 23:3. Nestle[2] finds a variation here due to different readings of an Aramaic original. Dill=*shabetha*, Rue=*shabera*. Here again, however, it is possible that the differences between the Gospels are entirely due to the editorial changes of Luke, as Harnack supposes. Further evidence of different translations has been found in Luke 11:39–41 and Matt. 23:25, 26. Besides minor indications Wellhausen calls especial attention to δότε ἐλεημοσύνην of Luke, which he regards as caused by a misreading of *zakki* for *dakki;* but it may be, with more probability, a Lukan editorial change.[3] Matt. 23:25

[2] Cf. also 12:47, 48. [2] *ZNW*, 1906, p. 10.

[3] See Luke 12:33=Matt. 6:19. Probably the whole verse, Luke 11:41, is a Lukan interpretation of the woe.

and Luke 11:39 are surely closely related, but what relation, if any, Matt. 23:26 and Luke 11:40, 41 have to each other is hard to determine.

Matt. 23:27 and Luke 11:44 both contain a comparison to tombs, but the conception of each is so different as to seem independent. Luke has not simply changed Matthew on the ground that whitened sepulchers would be unintelligible to his readers, for Luke 11:44 would be even more so to anyone but a Jew who was familiar with Num. 19:15. Matthew's comparison is the more evident, and if any relationship can be assumed at all, this is the secondary form. The change may have been suggested by the preceding woe, to which this seems to have been conformed. Certainly the difference between the two accounts is deep-seated and we may have two variant traditions.

Matt. 23:29–31 and Luke 11:47, 48 contain the same conception, differently expressed. Luke's form is more epigrammatic and forceful; by building monuments to the prophets, they only complete the works of their fathers and share in their guilt. The implication is that in this as in their religious observances all is mere outward show. The

thought is not as clear as might be wished in either the Lukan or Matthean version. Matt. 22:33 is an editorial insertion, but 23:32 may be original.

Concluding from these woes that the two gospels have in common, only a possibility is open that they were in Q. Not until we come to Matthew's epilogue of this discourse do we find a resemblance between the two accounts, such as we have always found before, pointing decidedly to a common Greek source. In Matt. 23:34–36; Luke 11:49–51, while we have not an extended verbal likeness, if we place the two texts side by side we see that both are built upon the same words and sentence structure.

Matt.: διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω
Luke: διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν ἀποστελῶ

Matt.: πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφήτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς
Luke: εἰς αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους

Matt.: ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενεῖτε καὶ σταυρώστετε, etc.
Luke: καὶ ἐξ αὐτὼν ἀποκτενοῦσιν.

Matt.: καὶ διώξετε, etc., ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν
Luke: καὶ ἐκδιώξουσιν ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ

Matt.: αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
Luke: τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον

Luke: ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης

Matt.: ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου ἕως τοῦ
Luke: ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἄβελ ἕως

Matt.: αἵματος Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχίου ὃν ἐφονεύσατε
Luke: αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου

Matt.: μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, ἀμὴν
Luke: μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου, ναὶ

Matt.: λέγω ὑμῖν ἥξει ταῦτα πάντα ἐπὶ τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην.
Luke: λέγω ὑμῖν ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης.

That the same text here lies behind both accounts seems certain, and we may add that it was probably a Greek text, though this is more doubtful. Here alone in this discourse can one with some measure of confidence attempt to restore an original form. Matthew, regarding Christ as Wisdom, has put the whole quotation into the mouth of Jesus, and hence changed the third to the second person; and Luke has made his usual changes to improve the literary style. Matthew has also inserted *Son of Barachiah* and expanded the description of Jewish persecutions, and Luke has changed "wise men and scribes" to "apostles."

Inasmuch as this paragraph is an integral part of the whole discourse in both accounts, the possibility that behind the whole section lies some common source becomes a probability. It is in this section that the problem of the relation which the two accounts have to an Aramaic original forces itself to the front as nowhere else; but even here the evidence for two different translations of such a Semitic original is very slight. At most we need only leave open the possibility of changes made at some time or other from the Aramaic.[1] Most of the differences, if not all, can be more readily accounted for on other grounds.

We shall find further support for the theory that the common source, Q, is the basis of this section in Matthew and Luke as we examine the whole discourse in the connection and sequence of topics in which the two evangelists give it. Luke has prefaced an introduction, which seems to have been suggested by Mark 7:1 ff. Only in the most superficial way does it suit the material which follows. Luke has likewise appended a historical note at the close, 11:53, 54. When these additions

[1] See above, pp. 17 f.

are omitted, vs. 39 follows naturally enough after vs. 36.[1] A relationship appears here which is independent of Luke and only obscured by him; and this confirms us in thinking that this section stood here in Q.

Matthew himself gives a much more elaborate introduction, combining the situation of Mark 12:38, 39, two woes of Luke, chap. 11, and some warnings of Jesus to the disciples, found only here. These warnings are so awkwardly inserted in 23: 1–3, where the multitudes of Mark, chap. 12, are combined with the disciples, and form such an unsuitable introduction to the woes which follow, that they may safely be regarded as an addition. It might be argued that Luke has omitted Matt. 23: 2, 3 because of their strongly Jewish Christian standpoint, but their kinship to Matt. 5:17–20, in its present composite form, adds to the probability that this is an insertion of the first evangelist. Matthew's introduction is therefore secondary, and there is no reason to doubt that he also found the common material, as we have suggested that Luke did.

[1] See above, p. 68.

In the woes themselves we find that Luke gives six, three directed against the Pharisees, three against the scribes ("lawyers" for "scribes" is Lukan). Such a distinction cannot be attributed to the third evangelist himself. It certainly was in the source he used. The three woes directed against the Pharisees are appropriate, as also are the first and last of those against the scribes, but the second woe against the scribes seems too general in its application, and it is noteworthy that the address to the scribes is this time omitted.

Matthew on the other hand has seven woes, all but one of which are directed against "scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites"; and that woe, which Luke has placed between the two woes upon the scribes, Matthew has put at the end, and the wisdom quotation he has made the epilogue of the whole discourse, vss. 29–36. Matthew also gives two woes which are not found in Luke. One of these, vss. 16–22, has a different epithet from the rest of the woes, "blind guides,"[1] and reads much more like a variant of Matt. 5:34 ff., which has been

[1] Matt. 15:14 uses the same epithet.

converted into a woe, than like the other condemnations here addressed to the Pharisees. This has probably been added by Matthew to complete the number seven. The woe of Matt. 23:15, however, is entirely appropriate. Its omission by Luke can be readily accounted for. Jewish proselyting ceased after the fall of Jerusalem and seems to have declined before then.[1] This woe would have no meaning to Luke's readers. The possibility suggests itself that we have here the third woe against the scribes, and that Luke found further ground for omitting it because he failed to see that the woe of 11:47 was directed against the multitudes in general and no particular class, and therefore thought he had one too many for the symmetry of the whole. This misunderstanding would explain also why vs. 52 is placed at the end; it served to bind the three woes together, if all were thought of as directed against the scribes.

This correction in the order of Luke on the basis of Matthew gives us a most tempting solution of the problems of the whole discourse. In Q, Luke

[1] See Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 85.

11:39–41 served as the introduction. Three woes upon the Pharisees followed, then three upon the scribes, with a concluding woe upon this generation, which brings us back to the situation of the preceding section on the demand for a sign. "This generation is an evil (and adulterous) generation," Luke 11:29. Luke's only changes in this order we have just explained.

Matthew has torn the whole section out of its context, fitting it into the situation of Mark, chap. 12. By removing two of the woes to use them in his introduction he has lost the original symmetry of the discourse but retained the plan of having seven woes. The order in which these were put was probably influenced by independent sources. In our discussion above of the woes which both Gospels give, we saw that the differences, in some cases at least, pointed to variant tradition rather than editorial changes. Matt. 23:27, 28 reads more like a variant of Luke 11:44 and in 23:26 the change in number and the use of *ἐντός*, *ἐκτός* for *ἔσωθεν*, *ἔξωθεν* may indicate that in this woe also Matthew is influenced by other sources. The woe of vss. 15–22 is certainly an addition

here. The paradoxical vs. 24 reads like a genuine saying of Jesus, but the title "blind guides" shows that it is related to vss. 16–22 rather than to the material common to Luke. However, vs. 5 might well have been omitted by Luke as too Jewish in its interest, but it is as easily explained as an addition; it certainly makes the woe too full. The warnings, vss. 2, 3, 7*b*–12, we have already given our reasons for regarding as an insertion. Matt. 23:15 is the only verse of this chapter, peculiar to Matthew, which we should be inclined to ascribe to Q. Whether the variations are all to be explained by Matthew's use of independent sources and Luke's editorial changes cannot be determined. At least no further explanation is necessary. Matthew's independent source (or sources) may itself have been related to Q, probably to the Aramaic original of Q. This would explain the possible variant translations. If it was only one source, it had both woes and warnings, and in like manner Luke 11:37 ff. is followed by a series of warnings to the disciples, and in this sequence Luke is merely copying Q.

SECTION 17. WARNING OF DANGERS BEFORE THE DISCIPLES WITH ASSURANCES OF GOD'S CARE, LUKE 12:1–12; MATT. 10:24–33; 12:32

When we come to this section we tread upon firm ground again. In Matt. 10:26*b*, 28*a*, 30, 31 and Luke 12:2, 4*a*, 7 we have that close verbal likeness which is conclusive evidence of a common source. That this source includes practically the whole section is shown by the common sequence of ideas:

Matt.,	vs. 26 =	Luke,	vs. 2
	27 =		3
	28 =		vss. 4, 5
	29 =		vs. 6
	vss. 30, 31 =		7
	vs. 32 =		8
	33 =		9

That Matthew should omit Luke 12:10 is most natural, for he prefers to use this verse in its Markan connection, Matt. 12:31. In Matt. 12:31, 32 the version of Mark and this of Q are placed side by side. The difficulty of determining the exact meaning of the verse in the Q context may have prompted Matthew to omit it there in the first place. That Luke transferred this sentence from its context in Mark to a position directly

after 12:9 is impossible to believe. The omission of Luke 12:11, 12 is even more readily accounted for. These verses have just been given in their Markan form, Matt. 10:19, 20=Mark 13:11. A repetition of the warning in this same discourse would be absurd.[1] There is no reason to question that Luke 12:2–12 stood in Q. But regarding 12:1*b* we cannot be so sure. The omission by Matthew may be due to the fact that this warning is developed more fully in Mark 8:14 ff. It is also possible that Luke could have introduced it from there. In itself the former alternative seems the more likely. The objection has been raised that there is no logical connection between 12:1*b* and 12:2. No doubt the soundest exegesis of this whole section will consider it as a collection of more or less independent sayings, but all are on the general theme of warnings to the disciples. Thus viewed, 12:1*b* appears as an appropriate introduction connecting these warnings with the preceding woes. Luke 12:1*b* is as closely related

[1] This is a strong indication that Mark 10:17–22 is not taken from Q, as Bernhard and Johannes Weiss have maintained. If Matthew is here using a source of Mark it is an independent one.

to 12:2 as 12:3 is to 12:4. This value of 12:1*b* as an introduction to 12:2 ff. favors the view that Luke found it here in his source if, as we shall try later to show, his sequence here is that of Q.[1] The evangelist himself has supplied a historical introduction of his own, 12:1*a*, and this shows no connection whatever with Mark 8:14 ff. The people who are out of place in vss. 2–12 are probably mentioned to prepare for vs. 15. Matt. 10:24, 25 are also doubtful verses. They may have stood here in Q and been omitted by Luke, but see further, p. 107.

Remembering then that Luke 12:1 and Matt. 10:24, 25 are questionable, we may with confidence assign this whole section to Q. But as usual it is a hazardous task choosing an original text from the alternatives of Matthew and Luke. Jülicher[2] has very thoroughly discussed vss. 2 and 3. His discussion shows that Luke 12:2 is an independent variant of Mark 4:22, and that the text of Matthew in 10:27 is not necessarily more original than that

[1] A further argument from the context, if this is the sequence of Q, appears in the condemnation of the Pharisees for hypocrisy in the preceding woes, Luke 11:44=Matt. 23:27.

[2] See *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, pp. 91–97.

of Luke 12:3. The change in person may be due to an original first person plural or to an impersonal passive, which both editors interpreted differently. In vss. 4, 5 (=Matt. 10:28) the differences can, for the most part, be attributed to Lukan changes. The text of Matthew is more pointed and epigrammatic. In vss. 6, 7 (=Matt. 10:29–31) also the priority belongs rather to Matthew, though the Lukan price of sparrows seems original and *τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν* is conceded by all to be secondary. "My Father who is in heaven" is a Matthean expression. Luke's phrase seems more original. It is found also in Luke 15:10, which may belong to Q.

The significance of vs. 10 in this connection is very obscure. It seems intended to define what is meant by "denying me in the presence of men," which we find in the preceding verse. Possibly it is intended merely to qualify that verse. Wellhausen is probably correct in his emendation of the text here on the basis of D and Marcion.[1] Matt. 12:32 also supports the emendation.

[1] "Whoever says anything against the Son of Man it shall be forgiven him, but against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven."

SECTION 18. INSTRUCTIONS TO SEEK THE KINGDOM AND LEAVE ALL ELSE TO GOD, LUKE 12:(13–21) 22–24; MATT. 6:19–34

The question whether or not Luke 12:13–21 belongs to Q will have to be deferred.[1] The relation of Luke 12:22–24 to Matt. 6:19–34 is such as to leave no possible doubt in our minds that both evangelists are using a common source. Matt. 6:21, 25–33 shows the closest verbal resemblance to Luke 12:22–31, 34. The most important difference is that Matthew has placed Luke 12:33, 34 at the beginning instead of at the end of the discourse. At least as far as the change in order is concerned Matthew must be responsible for the difference. The reason is apparent. He has placed this section in the Sermon on the Mount just after that contrast between human and divine rewards which he gives in 6:1–18; vss. 19, 20 therefore furnish the proper transition to the material which he here introduces. On the other hand, after Luke 12:21 the Matthean sequence would, if anything, be more appropriate than the order Luke himself gives; and it is not evident that

[1] See p. 168.

these verses form a better transition to what follows in Luke 12:35. It is interesting to note that Matthew has retained the διὰ τοῦτο of Luke 12:22, although it is no longer so appropriate in the new context.

Matt. 6:22, 23 is appropriate in the setting which Matthew has given it here, but, as we have seen, it is equally so in its Lukan context, 11:34–36; and the other changes of Matthew here make it safer to regard the position given to it by Luke as original, rather than this which it has in Matthew. The latter's setting is usually suitable. It is only when he fails to understand a saying that he places it in an awkward context. It is not certain, however, that he is here following the common source at all. The resemblance to Luke may be entirely due to harmonistic redaction.[1] Matt. 6:24 fits beautifully into this context of the First Gospel, but for this very reason is the more likely to be an insertion of Matthew. That Luke should remove it to its isolated position in 16:13 then becomes inexplicable. Matt. 6:34 is possibly also an addition of the evangelist, though in this

[1] See above, p. 69.

case it is more probable that Luke has omitted instead of Matthew's having added. Luke 12:32 is the only verse of Luke which is not found in Matthew as well, and this certainly belonged to Q.

In details Matthew is truer to the original than Luke. But "ravens" for "birds of the heaven," and "God" for "Heavenly Father," Luke 12:24, are to be preferred. Luke is also correct in reading "kingdom" without "righteousness" in 12:31. That Matthew is more original in 6:19–21 is shown by Luke's retention of *οὐδὲ σὴς διαφθείρει*, despite the fact that he has limited the treasure to money. Luke has interpreted this passage to accord with the teaching of his special material in chap. 16, giving it this definite application.

SECTION 19. PARABLES TEACHING THE NEED OF WATCHFULNESS FOR THE COMING OF THE SON OF MAN, LUKE 12:35–48; MATT. 24:42–51

Luke gives three parables here, two of which are found also in Matthew in practically the same words. Omitting for the present the problem whether that one which is peculiar to Luke was found in Q, we can positively affirm that the other two were found in that source. The verbal

agreement between 24:43–51 and Luke 12:39, 40, 42–46 is conclusive regarding this. In the first of these parables the differences are too insignificant to concern us. In the second, however, Luke has applied an interpretation to the parable which has affected the form of its presentation. By the question of Peter which is inserted in 12:41 this last parable is given a definite application to the twelve. Special responsibilities rest upon them. It is in accordance with this that *δοῦλος* is replaced by *οἰκονόμος* in vs. 42 and *συνδούλους* is changed in vs. 45. The two verses which Luke has appended at the close are also placed here because of this interpretation of Luke. They may rest upon some good tradition, but they are an insertion here. Changes made by Matthew are insignificant; *σιτομέτριον* is probably more original than *τροφή* in vs. 45.

SECTION 20. WARNING OF A PERIOD OF STRIFE AND DISASTER, LUKE 12:49–53; MATT. 10:34–36

In this short section we cannot be so sure of the presence of Q as we would wish. But Matt. 10:34 and Luke 12:51 rest on the same source:

Matt.: Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην
Luke: Δοκεῖτε ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην δοῦναι

Matt.: ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην
Luke: ἐν τῇ γῇ; οὐχὶ λέγω ὑμῖν

Matt.: ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν
Luke: ἀλλ' ἢ διαμερισμόν

Luke uses more elegant Greek, but Matthew preserves the Semitic parallelism and is probably original. Still, the interrogatory form of Luke, *δοκεῖτε* for *μὴ νομίσητε*, seems to deserve priority (so Harnack). Matt. 10:35 and Luke 12:53 certainly are derived from a common source, but since this verse is found in Mic. 7:6 it does not mean so much as it otherwise would. The form of the saying is much more simple and direct in Matthew than in Luke. One can hardly doubt that it is Luke who has expanded. Matthew may also have added vs. 36, the closing clause of Mic. 7:6. That Matthew omits the two verses with which this section begins in Luke can be explained by the context of chap. 10, where the personal note of these verses would be out of place. Matthew likewise omits the reference of Mark 10:38 to

Christ's baptism of suffering. Has he some repugnance to this comparison?

SECTIONS 21 AND 22. SIGNS OF THE TIMES AND THE NEED OF REPENTANCE, LUKE 12:54–56 (MATT. 16:2*b*, 3); THE APPROACHING JUDGMENT, LUKE 12:57–59; MATT. 5:25, 26

In Luke 12:54–56 we have a passage which strangely enough has a parallel in many MSS of Matt. 16:1–4, which, moreover, is so different that it cannot be a mere scribal transference from Luke. This would simply be another example of Matthew's general method of inserting Q sayings in a Markan context, if only the MSS gave us sufficient reason for believing that it stood originally in the Gospel of Matthew. Matt. 16:2*b*, 3 is omitted by ℵ, B, V, X, 13, 24, 556, 157, Ss. Sc. Jer. (in most MSS), Cop. Orig. They are given by 2, 3, C, D, e, a, b (K is wanting here), Jer. (in some MSS), Hil., Vulg., S1.[1] The MS authority certainly favors the omission; but where D and the Old Latin cannot be accused of harmonizing, their testimony has weight. Comparing the addition with Luke 12:54–56, the principal difference we

[1] Evidence taken from Zahn, *Kom. Mat., in loc.*

observe is the change which is made in the weather signs. Those which Luke gives are suitable only to Palestine[1] and might readily be changed when the sayings of Jesus were given a wider circle of readers. They would be especially inappropriate in Rome, where many suppose the First Gospel was written. The conclusion in both gospels shows literary relationship:

Matt.: τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
Luke: τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

Matt.: γινώσκετε διακρίνειν, τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν
Luke: οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τοῦτον

Matt.: οὐ δύνασθε;
Luke: πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν;

It is hard to believe that the same text does not underlie these variants. τῆς γῆς καὶ Wellhausen has shown to be an addition in Luke,[2] and the other changes look like literary improvements of that evangelist. Such likeness with so much variation and the location which the passage has in Matthew are excellent circumstantial evidence

[1] See Plummer, *Com. Luke, in loc.*

[2] See *Kom. Luk., in loc.*

that Matthew himself wrote 16:2*b*, 3. If he did not make this insertion in the saying taken here from Mark, someone so like him in method did that we cannot tell the difference. But apart from this doubtful testimony of Matthew the fact that it is combined by Luke with a passage which Matthew certainly gives, but not in its original setting, as we shall try to show, supports its claim to a place in Q. Moreover, the teaching of the passage represents exactly the same standpoint that we find in Q, Luke 11:29 ff.; Matt. 12:38 ff.

It is time now to consider the section which follows in Luke 12:57–59; Matt. 5:25, 26. Despite the very different interpretations which Matthew and Luke put upon this passage, it must be regarded as coming from their common source. Matt. 5:26 and Luke 12:59 are almost word for word the same. Luke has merely substituted the more appropriate, better Greek word λεπτόν for κοδράντην. In Matt. 5:25 and Luke 12:58 the differences are greater, but the same sentence structure appears in both. While a common source seems required, its exact language cannot be restored. πράκτωρ is no doubt to be preferred to the commonplace

ὑπηρέτης; κατασύρῃ and ἀπηλλάχθαι of Luke are both more striking, vigorous terms, but not necessarily more original. The Latinism δὸς ἐργασίαν is very puzzling. If κοδράντην was changed to λεπτόν, it surely was not the same editor who inserted this phrase, though he might have allowed it to remain if he had it before him.

Because of its bearing upon the problem raised by the preceding section, the question of the position of this passage ought perhaps to be discussed in anticipation of what is to be said on this general theme later. The first difficulty is in trying to learn exactly what the saying means. Even Jülicher's[1] discussion is not very illuminating. In its Matthean context he understands it to be a vivid concrete warning to live up to the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer in its full force. But he recognizes that there is even in the Matthean form of this saying an eschatological tone which is inconsistent with such an interpretation. In its Lukan context he finds here "nur eine bildliche Darstellung des δίκαιον das dem Urteil der Massen leider bisher fehlt." But obscure as vs. 57 certainly is,

[1] See *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, p. 240.

something more of a connection with what precedes is surely meant. The multitudes are told in the preceding verses, 54–56, to interpret the signs of the times as truly as they interpret the weather signs. The best commentary on this saying is to be found in Luke 11:29 ff. (Q). What is going on in their midst, and especially the teaching of Jesus, ought to warn them of the need of repentance. Attention is directed to the judgment of God which threatens them. Verse 57 seems to say that if they examined their own conduct honestly they would learn the same lesson. In their own affairs they recognized the importance of making peace with an adversary before the case progressed so far that reconciliation was impossible. Taking, then, themselves as an example, they should use as much concern in avoiding God's judgment as they would in escaping the judgment of men. The obscurity of the passage is largely due to the form of the parable. It is given as a command, and the deeper meaning is only implied by the pregnant ἀμὴν λέγω σοι. This is not necessarily against the originality of the form here. All of Jesus' parables cannot be conformed to the quiet, calm tone of the "wise"

man. As it stands, it is not necessary to give an allegorical interpretation to every feature. It can still be a true parable though in this dramatic form. The objections, therefore, which Jülicher has presented against this Lukan position of Sec. 22 seem exaggerated, and, as he himself acknowledges, the position in Matthew is out of the question. The eschatological tone demands a context different from that of Matt. 5:25 but like that of Luke, chap. 12. It is also a recognized fact that Matt., chaps. 5–7, is an editorial composition which raises a natural presumption in favor of the Lukan location. Now if Sec. 22 belongs in the connection which Luke gives, then we may well believe that Sec. 21 also stood in Q whether or not it stood in Matthew also.

SECTION 24.[1] PARABLES SHOWING THE HIDDEN POWER OF THE KINGDOM, LUKE 13:18–21; MATT. 13:31–33

These two parables were both found in Q by Matthew and Luke. Luke has retained them practically as they were in the source. Matthew agrees with Luke verbally in the second, but has

[1] For Sec. 23, which is found only in Luke, see p. 170.

combined Q and Mark in the first. In vs. 31, *ὁμοία ἐστὶν . . . . κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος . . . . ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ* (?) *αὐτοῦ*, and in vs. 32, *δένδρον . . . . ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ* show the influence of Q.

SECTION 25. DISCOURSE ON THOSE WHO ARE TO ENTER THE KINGDOM, LUKE 13:23–30; MATT. 7:13, 14, 21–23; 8:11, 12

What Luke gives in one section is reflected at least in these three different passages of Matthew. Matt. 7:13, 14 is somehow related to Luke 13:23, 24. Matt. 7:21–23 shows a connection with Luke 13:25*b*, 26, 27, and Matt. 8:11, 12 must be closely related to Luke 11:28, 29. In the last case literary evidence of a common source is conclusive. In Matt. 7:21–23 there is clearly a conflation of two conceptions.[1] The one is that of the Sermon on the Mount, which condemns those who make professions and do not carry out the teachings in their lives; and the other is a condemnation of those who claim admittance to the kingdom because of privileges they have enjoyed or powers they

[1] See above, p. 29.

have shown. This latter conception is that of Luke in the section before us. κύριε, which apparently means only "teacher" in Luke 6:46, is eschatological in Matt. 7:21, as it is in Luke 13:25*b*. The relation between Luke 13:27 and Matt. 7:23 is close throughout. In Matthew, however, those rejected base their claim upon the works they have done in the name of Christ; the evangelist still has the false prophets of 7:15 in mind. Luke, on the other hand, contrasts the Jews who have had the privilege of being with Jesus, and the Gentiles. The form of Matthew is certainly secondary[1] and Luke's connection with 13:28, 29 may well be original. Inasmuch as this passage is an insertion in Matthew, the probability that it was taken from the Lukan context is increased. It is also important that a few verses before this, in Matt. 7:13, we have the εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης (θύρας) of Luke 13:24. The rest of Matt. 7:13, 14 might be regarded as an adaptation of this saying to the practical precepts of the Sermon on the Mount by combining it with the common Jewish conception of the two ways, the way of life and the way of

[1] Note also what is said below, p. 125.

death; but of this there will be more to say presently. That Matt. 7:13, 14, 21, 22 stood in some source independent of their present connection is certain, and, since they can be readily understood on the basis that this evangelist had Luke 13:23–30 before him (allowing of course for changes on the part of Luke), this gives us our simplest and most natural hypothesis. The one saying of Luke here omitted, 13:28, 29, is inserted very aptly in connection with the incident immediately following, Matt. 8:11, 12. This theory is also strengthened by the fact that we have in these scattered fragments of Matthew the order of Luke still preserved.

But while we have good assurance that this section stood in Q, the exact form of Q can only be conjectured. The free use which Matthew has made of this material renders it difficult to eliminate the changes made by Luke. The problem is whether Luke has combined three sayings, only loosely connected in Q, into a closer unity or whether all the changes have been made by Matthew. In favor of the former it may be urged that such loose connection, where the theme

remains the same, is not unknown in Q,[1] and the separation into three different contexts on the part of Matthew becomes more natural if this was the case. Again attention has been called to the relationship between Luke 13:25, the verse which forms a connecting link in Luke, and Matt. 25:11, 12, the conclusion of the parable of the Ten Virgins. The situation is similar in both cases, the closed door, and some shut out who cry for admittance, almost in the same words, *κύριε* [*κύριε*] *ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν*. In the reply at least one clause is common to both, *οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς*. But in Luke, chap. 13, it is a householder and not a bridegroom, nor is there any reference to the feast[2] and the virgins. Luke's familiarity with Matthew's parable of the Ten Virgins can by no means be argued from this likeness, nor, on the other hand, are we justified in arguing, with Wellhausen, that Matthew's parable is only an amplification of this saying. The point of contact is too slight. Still, it remains possible

[1] See especially Luke 12:1 ff.

[2] J. Weiss regards *ἐγερθῇ* as such a reference, but it only emphasizes the act of shutting the door according to good Semitic usage.

that Luke has inserted this verse from the situation described in some recension of the parable of the Ten Virgins known to him, thinking that the same situation was implied here. Such editorial handling of material is consistent with Luke's method, as shown elsewhere, and seems, on the whole, an easier explanation than to ascribe all the change to Matthew. The probability then arises that Matt. 7:13*b*, 14 is not to be explained on the basis of Luke 13:24, but rather that Luke for the sake of closer connection has changed πύλη to θύρα and generalized 7:13*b*, 14 into 13:24*b*. According to this view, Matthew, in his characteristic manner, found in his discourses suitable settings for these more or less independent sayings. But Luke, under the influence of other tradition, gave the sayings a new setting, which bound them into a closer unity.[1]

In Matt. 8:11, 12 and Luke 13:28, 29 it is immaterial which gives the true order of the clauses; the sense is the same. The fact that "there shall

[1] Wellhausen in his commentary prefers the Lukan form throughout this section. Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, I, 130, argues for that of Matthew. See also Harnack, p. 67, and Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, II, 458.

be weeping and gnashing of teeth" has been adopted by Matthew as a common concluding clause, and that, therefore, he would be more inclined to treat it in the same way here, is of more weight than all the evidence brought forth by Harnack (p. 56) for the priority of Matthew. Luke has the clause only here. More important is Harnack's suggestion that ἐκβαλλομένους and ἐξελεύσονται are not necessarily different translations of *appeq*. Luke may have made the change with only the Greek ἐξελεύσονται before him. Luke 13:30 is an addition of the evangelist. It is not likely that Matthew would have omitted it if it stood in Q.[1]

SECTION 26. LAMENT OVER FORSAKEN JERUSALEM, LUKE 13:34, 35; MATT. 23:37–39

For our present purpose we need only call attention to the close verbal resemblance which shows a common source. ἔρημος may be regarded as original in the text of Matthew but it does not belong to Q.

[1] See further *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1906, Part II, pp. 97 ff., article by F. C. Porter.

SECTION 27. FEARFUL COST OF DISCIPLESHIP, LUKE 14:25–27 (28–35); MATT. 10:37, 38

No striking verbal likeness is found here but a close similarity in thought and logical sequence, nor are the changes hard to understand. Regarded by itself alone it would be questionable whether it belonged to Q, but when its position in the two Gospels is considered the probability becomes overwhelming.[1] In Luke, vs. 25 may well be an editorial introduction, though it is very appropriate here and its omission by Matthew was necessary. Verse 26 seems to have been expanded for the sake of completeness. The Semitic parallelism of Matthew supports its claim to priority. But Matthew has changed "is able to be my disciple" to "is worthy of me." ἄξιος is a favorite term of Matthew in this discourse, 10:10, 11, 13. On the principle that we should accept the harder reading, μισεῖ of Luke is preferable to the φιλῶν . . . . ὑπὲρ ἐμέ of Matthew.

SECTION 28. MISCELLANEOUS SAYINGS

This group of almost isolated sayings we find in Luke, chaps. 15, 16, 17, interspersed with inde-

[1] See p. 118.

pendent material. In Matthew they are placed in different, usually appropriate, contexts. The degree of resemblance varies.

The parable of the Sheep, Luke 15:4–7; Matt. 18:12, 13, has apparently been adapted by Luke to the situation he has created under the influence of the parable of the Prodigal Son. Matthew, on the other hand, has applied it to the problems of church discipline. Of the two, certainly Luke deserves the priority, for as we have seen Q was deeply concerned in the importance of repentance. No theme occurs there more frequently. But the very fact that Matthew has interpreted it so differently would indicate that Luke 15:7, true to the parable as it is, did not stand in his source. Beneath these differences there is an even more striking likeness; the essential features are the same in both accounts and the ideas are presented in the same sequence. This parable may, therefore, have stood in Q, but if it did it was in the form which Luke gives rather than that of Matthew, though Luke also has probably made minor linguistic changes, such as ἐρήμῳ for ὄρη, and τὸ ἀπολωλός for τὸ πλανώμενον.

God and Mammon, Luke 16:13; Matt. 6:24, is another of this group of sayings; the unmistakable verbal likeness here shows that it belonged to Q.

Storming the Kingdom, Luke 16:16; Matt. 11:12, 13, is hardly a saying which would have been long preserved except as it stood in writing. Moreover, the very difficulty of understanding it would favor editorial change. Matthew has used it to show that John the Baptist, while not in the kingdom, was still the Elias whose coming would introduce it. In Luke no plausible connection with its context has as yet been proposed. The three sayings of 16:16, 17, 18 seem entirely out of place, though they have a sort of unity in themselves, each correcting a possible misinterpretation of the other. That 16:16 does not mean that the law is no longer of value is shown by 16:17, and 16:18 may be regarded as an illustration of the way in which the law is still valid. Harnack has well said that Luke and Matthew probably did not themselves understand what this saying meant. The form in which Matthew gives it is the more difficult and on this account deserves the preference.

The similar passage in *Edujoth* viii, 7, quoted by B. W. Bacon in the *Expositor*, July, 1902, and by Allen in his commentary on Matthew, indicates how this obscure saying gives to the Baptist the functions of the coming Elias and favors the connection with Matt. 11:14. Luke may have omitted Matt. 11:14 because he failed to see any relation. It is also possible that he objected to the idea. We note that he has omitted Mark 8:9–13.

Validity of the law, Luke 16:17; Matt. 5:18. This time it is Luke who gives the saying in its harder form. It may be that, as Harnack (p. 56) suggests, this is due to later Hellenistic exaltation of the Old Testament, but the literary evidence does not oppose but favors the priority of Luke. The two ἕως ἄν clauses in Matthew cannot possibly be original. The simple, clear statement of Luke is not secondary. Still, such a detail as ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ may have been omitted by him.

Adultery, Luke 16:18; Matt. 5:32, is also to be compared with Mark 10:11. Here if anywhere in Luke is a case of conflation.[1] Retaining the form of Matt. 5:32 as far as possible, he gives

[1] So Harnack, p. 57.

it the sense of Mark 10:11. Of course, *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* is an insertion of Matthew.

Giving Offense, Luke 17:1, 2; Matt. 18:6, 7. Here we find the conflation on the part of Matthew, as is more usual. Matt. 18:6 follows Mark 9:42, though the expression *συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα* probably was taken from Q; for Luke's *λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ εἰ*, which has essentially the same meaning, is shown to be an editorial change by the *ἢ ἵνα* of the second member of the adversative clauses in Luke. Matt. 18:7 adds the thought of Q which was not given in Mark. The first clause is inserted because of the new position.

Forgiveness, Luke 17:3, 4; Matt. 18:15, 21, 22, comes in both Gospels just after the foregoing passage on giving offense. Literary relationship here is wanting, but the likeness of thought is such that when both evangelists give the saying in the same position a probability arises that this too belonged in Q. Between vss. 15 and 21 Matthew has inserted characteristic material on the theme of Luke 17:3*a*, which may account in part for the differences. A new introduction for Luke 17:4 was thus made necessary. Luke is himself fond of interrogations from the disciples to emphasize

a teaching of Jesus, and it is therefore less probable that he would have omitted the question of Peter, Matt. 18:21, if it stood in Q. Harnack, however, argues for the priority of Matthew because his text is more Semitic. In fact, either form might be original here, but Luke 17:3 is certainly to be preferred to Matt. 18:15.

Faith, Luke 17:5, 6; Matt. 17:20*b*, is inserted by Matthew into a Markan context. There is some literary likeness here:

Luke: Ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως ἐλέγετε
Matt.: Ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως ἐρεῖτε

The Markan context of Matthew may be said to favor the change of "tree" to "mountain." The possibility that this stood in Q is to be allowed. If so, it forms an interesting parallel to Mark 11:23.

Two other sayings may properly be considered here, because we have seen that they cannot be original in the position which Luke gives them, 6:39, 40. The very fact that this is the only case where we have found reason for doubting the Lukan setting of a common saying is itself striking. These verses have their parallel in Matt. 15:14; 10:25. Matt. 15:12–14 is generally recognized as an insertion into the Markan discourse of 7:17–23.

If therefore neither evangelist has preserved the original context, the conjecture suggests itself that the parable stood originally in this miscellaneous group of short sayings. Matthew and Luke would then each have given it a different setting. But if, as is probable, this was a current proverb, the verbal likeness between the Gospels can be accounted for without supposing any literary connection. As for Luke 6:40; Matt. 10:25, more can be said for the Matthean position. The passage is there in every way appropriate, the connection with what follows is satisfactory. Still, if Luke has here taken this saying out of the discourse in which it stood in Q and has transferred it to another, it is the only example of such transposition, not only in this common material but in Mark also. On the other hand, such changes are frequent in Matthew and he shows the highest skill in making them. The Sermon on the Mount is a masterpiece of such combination. If any relation is here to be assumed, this saying must also be added to the miscellaneous group of this section. Luke might have inserted an isolated saying into 6:40, but he would not have removed it from the

situation of Matt. 10:25 to insert it elsewhere. The question arises again whether any literary connection at all is to be understood.[1]

Luke 22:28–30; Matt. 19:28 have also been compared and assigned to Q, but no common literary source is here likely, unless this whole passage of Luke be assigned to Q. Objections to that will be considered later.[2]

SECTION 29. THE WHEN AND THE WHERE OF THE SON OF MAN'S COMING, LUKE 17:20–37; MATT. 24:26–28, 37–41

The presence of a common source is borne witness to by the following literary resemblance:

Luke: *καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν, ἰδοὺ . . . . ἰδοὺ . . . . , μὴ ἀπέλθητε μηδὲ . . . .*

Matt.: *Ἐὰν . . . . εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν, ἰδοὺ . . . . μὴ ἐξέλθητε, ... ἰδοὺ . . . . μὴ . . . .*

Luke: *ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ . . . . ἐκ . . . . εἰς . . . . οὕτως ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.*

Matt.: *ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ . . . . ἀπὸ . . . . ἕως . . . . οὕτως ἔσται . . . . τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.*

[1] It is interesting that another parallel to Matt. 10:15 is found in John 13:16.

[2] See below, pp. 157 f. and 179.

In Matt. 24:38*b*, 39*a*, 40, 28; Luke 17:27, 34, 35, 37 the verbal likeness is self-evident.

Matthew is probably more original in 24:26. The idea of the Messiah hidden in the desert or secret chambers would be intelligible to a Jew but meaningless to gentile readers. Moreover, the Lukan form is found just before this in 17:21 and in Mark 13:21 also. So also in 24:27 Matthew's form is more concrete, but whether ἡ παρουσία is original is more doubtful. Matthew alone of the evangelists uses the word. It is found for the first time in his introduction to this discourse, 24:3. In 24:40 Matthew is again more true to the original in retaining ἀγρῷ for κλίνης, the men in the field are compared to the women at the mill. Luke has sacrificed the parallelism in order to introduce the night as well as the day and possibly also to emphasize the closeness of those who are separated.

A more important question is whether we have sufficient grounds for including in the discourse anything which Luke alone gives. There is certainly an antecedent probability that Matthew, in combining this discourse with Mark, chap. 13, might omit some things which seemed to him imma-

terial. We should expect him to leave out the parallel reference to the days of Lot, which adds nothing to the thought but which is appropriate in Q, whose characteristic it is to present such parallel illustrations. On the other hand, 17:31, 32 reads very much as if it were a further reflection on the reference to Lot, influenced possibly by Mark 13:15 ff.[1] Luke 17:33 certainly seems to be an addition here. Wendt argues that this is the misplaced Q parallel to Mark 8:35 and that it is found in its true position in Matt. 10:39; but this rests upon the assumption that, because it occurs twice in Matthew and Luke, it must have stood both in Mark and Q. This is untenable.[2] Luke 17:25, as Wellhausen has shown,[3] is very appropriate in this context, and γενεᾶς ταύτης reminds us strongly of the section on a demand for signs, and the conclusion to the woes on the Pharisees and scribes, Matt. 12:38 ff.; chap. 23 (cf. also 11:16). In regard to 17:20, 21 we can hope for nothing

[1] Wellhausen reverses, making 17:31–33 original and 17:28–30 an insertion.

[2] Other reasons for regarding this verse as secondary are given on p. 203.

[3] See *Kom. Luk., in loc.*

conclusive. The saying is independent of what follows, apart from the difference of address, which may be merely editorial. However, it is not unusual for Q to put independent sayings side by side merely because they concern the same general theme. Nor is the omission by Matthew significant. The saying was not so important to him as it is to us today. There is no sufficient reason for denying that this stood in Q, but we cannot positively affirm that it did. The thought of the saying is not unlike that of the parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, Sec. 24. The proverbial saying of Matt. 24:28; Luke 17:37 has its true position in Matthew, not Luke. The question with which Luke introduces it is suspicious. The "Where, Lord," has been answered in 17:23, 24 and is inserted here to bring the reader back to the same situation. To Matthew the saying meant either that, as certainly as the vultures gather about the dead body, the disciples will find the Messiah without signs or seeking;[1] or, better, that the place will reveal itself as the vultures betray where the corpse is—when the time comes they will know.[2]

[1] So Jülicher. [2] So Wellhausen.

Luke has removed the saying from its context and given it an emphatic position at the end. Can it be because he found some allegorical reference to the eagles in the Roman standard?

SECTION 30. THE DUTY OF THE DISCIPLES UNTIL THE SON OF MAN COMES, LUKE 19:11–28; MATT. 25:14–30

This parable has taken very different forms in the two Gospels, but the evidence for a common source is only made the more striking thereby, because common features in thought and language are retained where they are no longer appropriate. As Jülicher has shown,

Luke: Ἄρατε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν μνᾶν καὶ δότε τῷ τὰς δέκα
Matt.: Ἄρατε οὖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ τάλαντον καὶ δότε τῷ

Luke: μνᾶς ἔχοντι
Matt.: ἔχοντι τὰ δέκα τάλαντα

is quite out of place after Luke 19:17, "Wie kindlich wäre der Hinweis auf seinen Besitz von 750 Mark wenn er Verwalter einer Provinz geworden war."[1] In like manner the mention of just three servants in Luke 19:15 ff. after ten are

[1] Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, p. 493.

introduced in 19:13 reveals the influence of the common source. Any synopticon makes it clear that we have to do with material having a literary relationship in Matt. 25:24–29; Luke 19:21–24, 26.

It is evident also that Matthew has adhered more closely to his source than has Luke. The only verse of Matthew which we can be sure is an editorial insertion is vs. 30; but vss. 16–18 are superfluous and may also have been added. The expression "enter thou into the joy of thy Lord" is most naturally interpreted as a reference to the future messianic hope, but, inasmuch as both evangelists recognize this element, there is no reason for denying that it stood in Q. However, as Jülicher says, it was only incidental there.[1]

Luke has converted the householder into an aspirant for the throne. The experience of different members of the Herodian family undoubtedly suggested this application. Luke intended thereby to set forth the future coming of Christ, emphasizing the delay which will intervene. Verses 11, 12*b*, 14, 15 (λαβόντα τὴν βασιλείαν), 17, 19 (the ten and

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 481.

the five cities), 27, 28 are therefore to be regarded as editorial. There is hardly sufficient reason for saying that Luke has here conflated two parables and for identifying the king here with the king in Matthew's parable of the Wedding Feast, Matt. 22:11 ff.[1] As soon as any attempt was made to allegorize the parables of Jesus, nothing was more natural than to introduce king and kingdom. Luke's account is, however, to be preferred in its use of *μνᾶ* for *τάλαντον*. Whether in the source the money was distributed equally, or, as Matthew says, "according to the ability of each," can hardly be decided. Both Jülicher and Harnack prefer the Matthean form for different reasons. Luke 19:25 is one of those interrogations whose insertion is characteristic of Luke. It is surely secondary here.

SUMMARY

We have now completed the list of passages in which we have sufficient evidence of a written Greek source underlying both Matthew and Luke, allowing of course the probability that either evangelist may preserve some things omitted by

[1] So Harnack, p. 125.

the other. In regard to the parable of the Great Feast, Matt. 22:2–11; Luke 14:16–24, which critics used to assign to this source, the relation there between the two Gospels is not such as would indicate a common written source. All literary resemblance has disappeared. The similarity is just such as we should expect to arise from a common oral tradition. While of course it cannot be categorically denied that this incident stood in Q, we may still venture to assert that it probably did not.

The following table will summarize the results of the preceding discussion:

Section		
1. Preaching of John the Baptist	Luke 3:7–9, 16*b*–17	Matt. 3:7–12
2. Temptation of Jesus	Luke 4:1–13	Matt. 4:1–11*a*
3. Discourse on Love, the Principle of Conduct	Luke 6:20–23, 27–33, 35–38, 41–49	Matt. 5:3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 39, 40; 5:44–48; 7:1–5, 12, 18, 19, 22, 24–27
4. Commendation of a Centurion's Faith	Luke 7:1–10	Matt. 7:28*a*; 8:5–10, 13
5. Discourse on John the Baptist	Luke 7:18, 19, 22–28, 31–35	Matt. 11:2–11, 16–19

Section

6. Following Jesus
   Luke 9:57–60 (61, 62) Matt. 8:19–22

7. Commission to the Disciples (Matthew has here combined Mark and Q)
   Luke 10:1–12 Matt. 9:37, 38; 10:5–16

8. Woes on the Cities Which Fail to Respond
   Luke 10:13–16 Matt. 11:21–24

(9. Return of the Disciples
   Luke 10:17–20)

10. Jesus' Self-Revelation to His Disciples
    Luke 10:21–22 Matt. 11:25–27

11. Prophets' Desire for What the Disciples Have Seen
    Luke 10:23–24 Matt. 13:16, 17

12. Prayer, Promise to the Disciples of Divine Help
    Luke 11:1–4 (5–9), 9–13 Matt. 6:9–13; 7:7–11

13. Calumny of the Pharisees (Matthew has here combined Mark and Q)
    Luke 11:14–23 Matt. 9:33*b*; 12:22–30

14. Seven Other Spirits
    Luke 11:24–26 Matt. 12:43–45

15. Demand for a Sign from Heaven
    Luke 11:29–32, 34*a*, 35, 36 Matt. 12:38, 39, 41, 42

16. Woes on the Pharisees, the Scribes, and This Generation (Matthew has here combined Mark and Q)
    Luke 11:39–44, 46–54 Matt. 23:4, 6, 13, 15, 23, 25, 27–32, 34–36

Section

17. Warnings of Danger with Assurances of God's Care
    Luke 12:1*b*–12 — Matt. 10:(24, 25) 26–33
18. Instructions to Seek the Kingdom
    Luke 12:22–24 — Matt. 6:19–21, 25–34
19. Parables Teaching Need of Watchfulness
    Luke 12:(35–38) 39–46 — Matt. 24:42–51
20. Warning of a Period of Strife and Disaster
    Luke 12:(49, 50) 51–53 — Matt. 10:34–36
21. Signs of the Times and the Need of Repentance
    Luke 12:54–56 — Matt. (16:2*b*, 3)
22. The Approaching Judgment
    Luke 12:57–59 — Matt. 5:25, 26

(23. Call to Repentance
    Luke 13:1–9)

24. Parables on the Kingdom
    Luke 13:18–21 — Matt. 13:31–33
25. Discourse on Those Who Are to Enter the Kingdom
    Luke 13:23–29 — Matt. 7:13, 14, 21–23; 8:11, 12
26. Lament over Forsaken Jerusalem
    Luke 13:34, 35 — Matt. 23:37–39
27. Fearful Cost of Discipleship
    Luke 14:25–27 (28–35) — Matt 10:37, 38
28. Miscellaneous Sayings:
    Lost Sheep
    Luke 15:4–7 (8–10) — Matt. 18:10–14
    God and Mammon
    Luke 16:13 — Matt. 6:24

Section

Storming the Kingdom
Luke 16:16 — Matt. 11:12, 13

Validity of the Law
Luke 16:17 — Matt. 5:18

Adultery
Luke 16:18 — Matt. 5:32

Giving Offense (Matthew has combined Mark and Q)
Luke 17:1, 2 — Matt. 18:6, 7

Forgiveness
Luke 17:3, 4 — Matt. 18:15, 21

Faith
Luke 17:5, 6 — Matt. 17:20

(Luke 17:7–10 — Matt. 5:14; 7:6; 13:44–46; 18:10)

29. When and Where of the Son of Man's Coming
Luke 17:(21, 20) 22–30, 34–37 — Matt. 24:26–28, 37–41

30. Duty of the Disciples until the Son of Man Comes (Luke has here recast the narrative)
Luke 19:11–27 — Matt. 25:14, 15, 19–29

The evidence seems sufficient to show that in each of these sections Matthew and Luke are using a common source or sources written in Greek. Some passages found only in one Gospel are here added in parentheses for the sake of completeness. They will be discussed later.

CHAPTER III

THE SEQUENCE OF PARALLEL SECTIONS IN MATTHEW AND LUKE

Merely to have shown the evidence of a common source in these various sections, which are necessarily separated on a somewhat arbitrary basis, is not sufficient. If the contention is really to be maintained that behind this material is a single common source, as behind the Markan material stands the source Mark, the disposal which each evangelist has made of these sections must be satisfactorily explained.

First, however, attention should be directed to the number of sections which stand in the same sequence in both Gospels:

Section		
1.	Preaching of John the Baptist	
	Luke 3:7–17	Matt. 3:7–12
2.	Temptation of Jesus	
	Luke 4:1–13	Matt. 4:1–11
3.	Discourse on Love	
	Luke 6:20–49	Matt. 5, 7 (in part)
4.	Centurion's Act of Faith	
	Luke 7:1–10	Matt. 8:5–13

Section

6. Following Jesus
   Luke 9:57–62 Matt. 8:19–22
7. Commission to the Disciples
   Luke 10:1–12 Matt. 9:37—10:16
8. Woes on Galilean Cities
   Luke 10:13–16 Matt. 11:20–24
10. Jesus' Self-Revelation
    Luke 10:21, 22 Matt. 11:25–27
13. Calumny of the Pharisees
    Luke 11:14–23 Matt. 12:22–32
15. Demand for a Sign from Heaven
    Luke 11:29–36 Matt. 12:38–42
16. Woes on Pharisees, etc.
    Luke 11:37–54 Matt. 23 (in part)
26. Lament over Jerusalem
    Luke 13:34, 35 Matt. 23:37–39
29. When and Where of Son of Man's Coming
    Luke 17:20–37 Matt. 24:26–28, 37:41
30. Disciples' Duty until Future Coming
    Luke 19:11–28 Matt. 25:14–30

Two sections of the thirty, Secs. 9 and 23, are of course to be omitted from consideration, because they are found only in Luke. This means that in fourteen out of the twenty-eight sections, common to both Gospels, there is not only a likeness of thought and language, but the sections themselves

stand in the same relative position. Again, a trace of the Lukan order sometimes remains in Matthew's composite discourses. A striking confirmation of our theory is found in Matt., chap. 10, for there, evidently, Matthew has gathered together instructions to the disciples which are scattered in Luke through various sections; but Matthew in combining them has retained all these sayings in their original sequence:

Sec. 7	Matt. 9:37—10:16	=	Luke 10:1–12
17	10:26–33	=	12:2–9
20	10:34–36	=	12:51–53
27	10:37, 38	=	14:25–27

How significant this is of that evangelist's method of compilation! Sec. 25 is also instructive from this standpoint. Luke 13:23, 24 = Matt. 7:13; Luke 13:26, 27 = Matt. 7:22*b*, 23; Luke 13:28, 29 = Matt. 8:11, 12. The same sequence appears in both Gospels. Such resemblances as these are not accidental; they are a strong confirmation of the whole theory of a common source Q.

But there are differences for which we must account. If this material comes from Q either

Matthew or Luke has transposed parts of it. If again we call to mind the results of our observation in Markan material, the strong presumption is created that such changes are for the most part due to Matthew. This is sufficient justification for using the sequence of Luke as the basis for further study.

For differences of sequence within the various sections we need only refer to the detailed discussions which have preceded. But, reviewing to get the data all before us, we found that in Sec. 2 Luke had changed the order of one temptation; in Sec. 3 slight changes were made by Matthew; in Sec. 7 the position of Luke 10:3 had been changed by Luke, but Matthew, compiling Mark and Q, had removed 10:7 = Luke 10:9*b* and 10:10*b* = Luke 10:7*b;* in Sec. 15 Luke had inverted the order of 11:31 and 11:32; in Sec. 16 the original sequence could not be determined with any certainty. Inasmuch as Matthew evidently conflated here, most of the changes were attributed to him, but the probability has been suggested that Luke inverted the last two woes. In Sec. 18 Matthew has changed the position of 6:19–21;

in Sec. 25 he has inverted 8:11 and 8:12; but in Sec. 29 the Matthean position of 24:28 is to be preferred to that of Luke. Sec. 28 cannot be considered here, for it is not a unit. Reference ought, however, to be made to Luke 12:10 and 12:11, 12. Matthew's position for these sayings is, as we have seen, determined by his preference for Mark. Changes within the various sections were made by both evangelists for editorial reasons, and when we consider the nature of the material they are surprisingly few. They total only twenty-one verses in material amounting to over two hundred verses.

Let us turn now to those differences which more immediately concern us here. Where Matthew and Luke do not put common material in the same general context can we depend upon the order of Luke, or must we here also allow for changes made by both evangelists? Does Luke divide discourses into fragments or does Matthew combine short sayings and groups of sayings into longer discourses? We know that the latter is true, but it remains to be shown whether this is always the case.

Wernle[1] refers to the saying of Luke 13:28, 29, which he says Luke has separated from its context in Sec. 4 and put later because he regarded the words as too sharp against Israel for this early period. Wernle must have forgotten the rejection at Nazareth, which Luke placed at the very beginning of the Galilean ministry. On the other hand, the position which Matthew gave this saying is readily understood if he had Sec. 25 before him as it stood in Luke.[2]

Sec. 8, *Woes on Galilean cities*, seems to be differently placed in Matthew and Luke, but it is really in the same relative position in both Gospels; the only difference is that Matthew has omitted the return of the disciples which follows it in Luke and inserted Sec. 5, the Discourse on John the Baptist, before it. That Matthew himself read Sec. 8 immediately after Sec. 7 is confirmed by the repetition of the Lukan introductory sentence, Matt. 11:24=Luke 10:12. Examining this difference from the standpoint of Sec. 5, we come to the same conclusion. Matthew felt constrained to give this section a later context, not only because

[1] *Die synoptische Frage*, p. 89. [2] See above, pp. 96 ff.

it did not properly belong to his miracle chapters 8 and 9, but because the reference to the wonderful works of Jesus demanded a later position in a Gospel which pretended to give a record of such works. This argument is supported by the fact that Luke felt the same difficulty, but, instead of changing the position of the section, he prefaced the raising of the widow's son and added a notice of Jesus' other wonderful works editorially. It is true that this discourse might still have come before chap. 10 in Matthew as well as after it. The reason why Matthew put it just where he did may be because of the connection he found between 11:19 and the woes on the Galilean cities. That wisdom is justified of her works will be revealed in the woes awaiting the cities in which these works were done.

Sec. 11 in Luke is an epilogue to Christ's self-revelation, 10:21, 22; in Matthew it is included in the chapter on parables. Luke's omission of it there is supported by Mark. It seems to take the place of Mark 4:13, praising them instead of blaming them. The context given this saying in Luke is surely as appropriate as the one in Matthew,

and the probability arises that Matthew, because of his insertion of that beautiful saying of Jesus, "Take my yoke upon you," omitted the original conclusion here and added it at the next suitable place. One can hardly believe that Luke would have omitted Matt. 11:28–30 if he had read it here.

Sec. 12, nearly all critics agree, was not originally a part of the Sermon on the Mount. Matthew must have found it somewhere else and combined it with that discourse. No reasonable objection appears why he may not have found it in the position which it has in Luke. Luke has retained it in its original context; Matthew has woven it into his Sermon on the Mount.

Sec. 14 Matthew has placed after Sec. 15; Luke, before. Matthew has sought to justify his sequence by the editorial addition of 12:45*b*. Jülicher,[1] seeking for an interpretation of this parable, finds it in its connection with Luke 11:23. But even if his interpretation be not accepted, the position of the parable for which he argues is certainly original. He makes it clear that Matthew

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 238.

is here secondary. Moreover, it is to be noticed that just where this parable appears in Luke, Matthew inserted the sayings from Mark about the sin against the Holy Spirit, and also the parable of the Tree and Its Fruit. This may in part, at least, account for his postponing this parable of the Seven Other Spirits. That he has not found a more appropriate place is only because he did not himself understand it. Our reasons for considering that Matt. 12:33–37 is not original here have already been given.[1] In Sec. 15 the two verses of Luke 11:34–36, which Matthew included in the Sermon on the Mount, have already been discussed. As we have seen, it is doubtful whether Matthew in 6:22, 23 is following Q at all. If he is, the Lukan context is still the more probable.[2]

Secs. 17, 20, 27 are combined by the first evangelist with the other instructions to the disciples in chap. 10; and the discourse on the relation of the kingdom to the world, Sec. 18, belongs properly in the great discourse of chaps. 5–7, as Matthew has conceived it. In all of these sections Matthew's position can be explained on the basis

[1] See above, pp. 61 f. [2] See p. 66.

of Luke's, but the context they have in Luke cannot be understood on the basis of the Matthean context.

Secs. 19 and 29 are combined by Matthew with the corresponding material of Mark. In Luke they are independent of Mark and in all probability preserved in their original sequence. Wernle argues that the separation of Sec. 19 and Sec. 29 shows Luke's tendency to scatter sayings of Q. But there is no evidence in the context of Luke 17: 20 ff. to indicate that Luke has purposely separated this from 12:35 ff.; and, as we shall try to show, there is a strong probability that in Q between these two sections there stood only material similar in tone. At any rate, Matthew, who is simply inserting this material into appropriate contexts of Mark, gives us no reason for believing that he found a differently arranged text in Q from that of Luke.

Secs. 21, 22 have already been fully considered.[1] There can be no choice between the positions given them by Matthew and Luke. If Sec. 21 stood in Matthew it was conflated with Mark. Sec. 22

[1] See pp. 90 ff.

Matthew has woven into the Sermon on the Mount, where its eschatological tone is out of place. Sec. 24 Matthew has simply inserted into a Markan context from which it is kept independent by Luke. Sec. 25 has already been sufficiently explained.[1] No one who grants that Matthew and Luke found this section in Q will question the priority of its position in Luke. The insertion of portions of it into the Sermon on the Mount is surely secondary.

Sec. 26 is made by Matthew a part of his conclusion of the woes upon the scribes and Pharisees. Everyone recognizes that it is thoroughly in the spirit of Jesus thus to close the denunciation, but the critic must also recognize that the appropriateness of this depends upon the situation in which Matthew placed these woes. This situation, however, comes from Mark and not from Q. Historically also it is improbable that these woes should have been spoken in Jerusalem at the close of Jesus' ministry when his foes were the priestly authorities more than the Pharisees. It is in the Galilean ministry that the Pharisees are empha-

[1] See pp. 96 ff.

sized. The evidence that Matt. 23:34–36 is a widsom quotation and not a direct word of Jesus, and therefore this saying could not properly follow it, is, as Harnack shows (p. 169), inconclusive. Still, it adds to the improbability of the Matthean connection. Matthew is no doubt correct in putting this saying during Jesus' sojourn in Jerusalem. Luke's independent saying, 19:41, gives us something similar for that period and the saying is surely more appropriate in Jerusalem than elsewhere. We have here the same phenomenon that has been shown before. Matthew has transposed a saying to a suitable Markan context; Luke has left it where it was, but used independent material as an appropriate historical introduction. The author of Q thought only of the teaching and the topical connection between Sec. 25 and Sec. 26.[1] There remains only Sec. 28, that group of fragmentary sayings which we find almost isolated in Luke. This has always been one of the great puzzles of that Gospel, but surely the critic who

[1] Geographical references are not given by Q, but if, as we shall try to show, Sec. 23 belongs to that source, we have before this a saying where a Jerusalem background is implied. See further, p. 170.

suggests that Luke removed these verses from the plausible contexts which they have in Matthew only adds to the difficulty. We must try to explain them on the basis of Luke. Matthew's disposal of them is then readily understood. He has only done here what we find he had done everywhere else.

What is the result of this examination? Does it not fully confirm what we have learned of Luke's habits in investigating Markan material? He adheres closely to the order of topics in his source. In no case have we found evidence that the position he gave a section was secondary to that in Matthew unless the proverbial saying of 6:40 be such an exception.[1] If so, it ought to be regarded only as the exception which proves the rule. Proof that the order of Luke is throughout that of the source has not been given, but his priority to Matthew has been made clear, and this establishes a presumption in favor of the Lukan sequence. It has long been recognized that in the study of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount Luke should be made the basis. It is time to appreciate also that in the whole question

[1] See above, p. 107.

of their second common source Luke and not Matthew is the key.[1] Matthew is of special value in determining the text and details, but of only secondary importance in our search for broader outlines. Even in details Luke has shown unusual care in this source, and Matthew's priority cannot be so frequently assumed as Harnack would make us believe. But Harnack, who in every case where he has any doubt gives the preference to the text of Matthew, himself says, "Tendenzen haben also bei Lukas nicht stärker gewirkt als bei Matthäus, ja sogar etwas schwächer."[2]

That Luke in his two great interpolations, chaps. 6 ff. and 9:51 ff., has inserted Q practically in the order which he found it, has been shown to be a good working hypothesis. Historical situations are created usually by the insertion of foreign material, sometimes by simple editorial notes; the greater part of the whole source is fitted into the scheme of a last journey to Jerusalem,

[1] H. von Soden, J. H. Moulton, and F. C. Burkitt are among those who have recognized this. I regret that I have not had access to the book of Dr. Armitage Robinson, quoted by F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Transmission*, p. 131.

[2] See p. 79. The English translation, p. 115, is obscure.

9:51, 53; 10:1; 13:22*b*; 17:11, but the material itself refuses to conform to such an itinerary. The topical sequence of sayings is also broken by incidents in Luke which are not found in Matthew. When we study the relation of Q to the independent material of Luke, we shall find these principles of method abundantly illustrated. The significant thing to us at present is that this method did not involve any serious changes in sequence, so that behind his historical notes the original plan of arrangement can still be discerned. It is for this that the modern scholar should be profoundly grateful. From the standpoint of practical usefulness the method of Matthew is much to be preferred.

How now has Matthew treated his source? Instead of trying to conjecture a context for a group of sayings without any introduction, he always did one of two things—he either fitted them into some context supplied by Mark, Secs. 1, 2, 3, 6,[1] 7, 11, 13, 16, 19, 21(?), 24, 28 (17:20; 18:6, 7), 29; or grouped them into a larger discourse,

[1] That Sec. 6 should come before the sending out of the disciples is simply due to its position in Q, but that it should come just where it does in 8:19 is probably because in Jesus' crossing the sea to the other side Matthew found the appropriate situation

Secs. 12, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28. The other sections, 4, 8, 10, 15, 30, have simply been left where they were in the source. Secs. 5 and 14 have had their positions slightly changed, for reasons already given. It is also to be noticed that in carrying out this plan the original sequence was retained as much as possible. In combining with Mark, he very often preserved the order of Q, and we have already shown how he did this in the discourse of chap. 10. Considering the nature of this material, Matthew's method is more natural and appropriate than that of Luke, and to anyone but the modern historian more satisfactory. The plan is carried out with great skill. Wherever Matthew fully understood a passage, the context which he gave it was suitable. This is only to be expected, for the men who wrote the Gospels were all men of ability, not bunglers. We should also remember that this hypothesis, by which we would explain the variations of Matthew and Luke in Q, is in full accord with what we should expect these

---

for the offer of the scribe to go with Jesus wherever he went. Luke, however, finds the appropriate situation in Jesus' journey through Samaria to Jerusalem, 9:51. Both evangelists connect it with going upon heathen soil.

evangelists to do after examining their treatment of Mark. The same principles apply in both cases, though the nature of the material justified Matthew in carrying the principle of regrouping much further in Q than he did in Mark. Indeed, he has made Mark the basis for rearranging Q.

Only a few years ago Harnack's treatise appeared, and demands fuller consideration from us as the latest attempt by a great scholar to explain these variations on the basis of Matthew. Following Wernle, he begins with Matthew and attributes all variations to Luke which he possibly can. But even he feels compelled to qualify the statement of Wernle that "almost everywhere Matthew has preserved a better text than Luke," with the correction, "doch hätte er hinzufügen müssen dass sich bei Matthäus einige sehr schwere Eingriffe in den Text finden wie sie sich Lukas nicht erlaubt hat." He accepts, however, the principle of Wernle that in Luke we have an "Umsetzung der Reden in Erzählungen" and even in the sequence of the sayings makes Matthew his basis. The result is that Sec. 4 of his second chapter is the weakest section in the book. The need of making Luke our

basis cannot be shown to better advantage than by examining this discussion.

Harnack recognizes, as everyone must, that up to and including the centurion of Capernaum incident the order is the same. He also notices that the instructions to the disciples are given in the same sequence in both Gospels, though in Luke they are distributed,[1] and then he says: "It is at the same time shown that these sections, which are indeed closely allied in the subject-matter, were not at first brought together by Matthew, but that in Q they stood in the same order of succession as that of the First Gospel; for it is clear that Luke also found them in this order. It is noteworthy that this evangelist has distributed them throughout chaps. 9, 10, 12, 14, 17 without altering their order of succession."[2] So noteworthy is it, in fact, as to seem impossible. No motive is apparent; it is done from pure arbitrariness. Luke never treated Mark in this way; why should it be assumed that he did so with Q, which he evidently

[1] The present writer had already mentioned this likeness in a paper before the Society of Biblical Literature in New York, December, 1906.

[2] See p. 175.

regarded with even more reverence? On the other hand, how perfectly natural that Matthew should desire to group together all instructions to his disciples, just as he grouped together the miracles of Mark, and that in so doing he should simply add them one to the other in the sequence in which he found them.

Then Harnack goes on to say that in Q the discourse on John the Baptist followed the sending out of the disciples. Why? "Because it has been proved that Matthew and not Luke has reproduced the arrangement of the source in (Matt.) chaps. 8–10." The proof in question is that which we have quoted above. The evidence we previously presented for the Lukan position of this discourse in Q is independent of either theory regarding the common sequence of the instructions to the disciples in Matthew and Luke.

Harnack points to the Lukan sequence of Secs.[1] 13, 15, 16, 19, 26, 28 (17:3, 4), 29, 30 (only the last sentence, Luke 19:26, is assigned by him to Q) and maintains that every difference from Matthew in order is due to Luke's changes. Luke

[1] Harnack's sections are so similar to those used in this discussion that for the sake of convenience the same numbers are used here as elsewhere. His numbers are different.

arbitrarily separated the Lament over Jerusalem from the Woes on the Pharisees. It is he who separated Sec. 19 from Sec. 29 and put the second part first. No attempt is made to say why Luke 17:3, 4 is differently placed. In fact it is acknowledged that the position of the seventeen concluding sayings (according to his arrangement) cannot be explained at all. Besides this, he says of all of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount which Luke has not retained in 6:20 ff., "this is hopeless." If he had closed with an explicit confession of failure in the whole attempt, it would certainly have been appropriate.

While one can never hope to know just why Matthew made each combination with Mark and each regrouping of sayings just as he did, plausible reasons can always be suggested. It is never so hopeless an inquiry as have been all attempts to find grounds for the transference and division of material which the critics have attributed to Luke. Nor can we always know just why Luke in each case adopted the historical setting which he did; but at least we can show that his treatment of the material is reasonable and natural.

CHAPTER IV

UNITY AND COMPLETENESS OF THE COMMON MATERIAL IN MATTHEW AND LUKE

Wendt's reconstruction of Q has been called "A heap of interesting ruins without beginning, without ending." Almost as much might be said of the source which Harnack has found. The semblance of order which he gives is reached only by omitting a large portion of the material. Has the Q which we have attempted to reconstruct any self-consistency? Can we imagine its having existed alone?

Examining once more these sections in the order which Luke gives them we find that Secs. 1 and 2 form a natural introduction. The resemblance here to Mark at once impresses us. Mark also began with the Baptist and his preaching. The likeness to Mark becomes yet closer when we recognize that the account of the temptation cannot have stood alone. Some reference to the baptism and the voice from heaven must have preceded. But Matthew and Luke have here followed Mark,

so that we can no longer know what account Q gave of the baptism. It is possible that the baptismal words, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee," which are found in the Old Latin MSS of Luke and in so many Church Fathers, are a trace of Q. One naturally asks whether this account of John the Baptist's preaching and of Jesus' baptism and temptation gives an appropriate introduction to a writing which deals primarily with teachings? While Q in no sense seeks to preserve a chronological order, we shall see that in broad outlines there is a recognition of the sequence the teachings had in Jesus' life. A collection that closed with eschatological teachings might properly start with material attached to the beginning of Jesus' ministry. The purpose which this introduction serves is evident: it presents the divine commission and power of the Jesus whose sayings are to be given. Although Sec. 1 retains the characteristics of John the Baptist, its primary interest is in his recognition of Jesus as the Messiah. This recognition is confirmed by the voice from heaven, an account of which must have followed, and also by his conquest of Satan in the temptation scene.

The intent of the whole is to present Jesus as the Messiah, the divinely authorized teacher. His wonderful works can then be assumed. It is consistent with this that he is called Son of Man from the beginning.[1] The term is not explained any more than it is in Mark, but, as is not so certain in Mark, in Q it always means the Messiah.[2] These sections also have a special interest to Q on their own account. Sec. 1 is related to Sec. 5, where a special concern in the Baptist is evident. The teaching of the need of repentance here was also something in which Q was deeply interested. In Secs. 8, 15, 21, 22, 23 it is repeatedly emphasized. Likewise the temptation, Sec. 2, showing Jesus' conquest over Satan, prepares for the development of the same theme, which we find later in Secs. 9 and 13.[3]

Nowhere in the whole writing is the sequence of thought harder to determine than in the next three sections. Secs. 3 and 4 were surely closely related in Q. Indeed in no place have both

[1] The title is doubtful in Luke 6:22, but both evangelists give it in Sec. 5 (Luke 7:34; Matt. 11:19) and it is used freely after that.

[2] Luke 9:58 is hardly an exception.

[3] For the relation here of Q to Mark see further, p. 190.

evangelists so carefully preserved the connecting link as here, and here is the only geographical setting in the whole source. One's first thought is that there is some historical reminiscence that has been retained. But we cannot think that any such historical connection would be sufficient explanation of its presence here if Q is at all what the rest of the common material would lead us to think it is. Moreover, in Sec. 4 the primary interest is not in the wonderful work of Jesus but in what Jesus says to the centurion. Harnack even thinks that in Q the account of the actual healing was not given.[1] That Jesus should thus commend a heathen for his faith was a word of the greatest significance to the early church; and it may well be that so full a narrative setting in this one case has been preserved just because of its unique importance. And at least a suggestion can be offered that may indicate some relation in thought to the preceding Sec. 3.

In considering Sec. 3 we must first free our minds from the composite discourse of Matthew which is most familiar to us. The theme of the

[1] See above, p. 42.

common material here is love, the great principle of conduct. Beatitudes are pronounced upon the humble disciples and they are taught to be kind and sympathetic even toward their enemies; thus they are to become sons of the Most High. Charity of judgment is commanded in unqualified terms. Unless they bear such fruitage the true life is not in them. They must not only say "Lord, Lord," they must "do" these things. Has it no significance that in immediate connection with this discourse on love and charity of judgment should come the narrative pointing to the high regard which Jesus showed toward the faithful Gentile? As we know, there was not another question so divisive in the early church as this of the Gentiles, none which so called for the exercise of the qualities commanded in the previous section. We are perhaps not justified in saying that that is the only reason Q had for putting this narrative just here, but at least we see that there is eminent appropriateness in this connection. It is also to be noticed that Sec. 5, which follows, takes up another problem of the early church, kindred to that of Sec. 4.

Attention has just been called to the concern in the Baptist shown in Sec. 1. He is there a distinct personality, but, as is clearly seen, one who humbly subordinates himself to the Christ. Sec. 5, likewise, while it dwells upon Jesus' high regard for the Baptist, closes Jesus' estimate of him with the words, "yet he that is but little in the Kingdom of God is greater than he"; and then attention is directed to the fact that the Jews treated John in the same way in which they did Jesus. One asks again, What is the meaning of this concern in John the Baptist, this careful definition of his true rela- relation to Jesus? Do we see here how at a much earlier period than the Fourth Gospel the first disciples met the problem of their own relation to the disciples of the Baptist, and of the use which was made of his name by other Jews as well? If so, there is great sympathy with the followers of the Baptist and a sense of kinship.

Jesus' words upon these special problems within the early church are succeeded by a group on the general theme of Jesus' relation to disciples, Secs. 6–12. The disciples here are never limited to the Twelve; they comprise the larger circle of

followers. Sec. 6 is really a call to service. Following Jesus is no easy matter. It means strenuous activity.[1] Home must be given up, natural duties to kindred must be left behind. To become a disciple one must put his hand to the plow and not look back. Sec. 7 contains Jesus' commission to the disciples as they are sent out to be laborers in the harvest. Their work is identified with Jesus' own work. In Sec. 8 woes are pronounced on the cities which have been the theater of Jesus' work and that of his disciples because of their failure to repent. Although the reasons for including Sec. 9 in Q have not as yet been presented, why Matthew should omit it is so evident and its close relation to the following section is so convincing that we have added it here for the sake of completeness. It may, however, be left out without materially affecting the present discussion. The joy of Jesus in the success of his disciples is expressed—his conquest of Satan is through them being completed. In Secs. 10 and 11 they are assured that,

[1] It is doubtful whether 9:58 can refer to Jesus' poverty; the context implies that he is too busy, not too poor, to abide in a home. Foxes and birds are appropriate because they also lead a wandering life, but even they have a home.

though they are only babes (in contrast to the scribes perhaps), they are learning that knowledge of God which Jesus would bring them. This is that for which the prophets and kings of the past have longed. Sec. 12 is not closely joined with what precedes, but it follows very naturally. A question about prayer is most appropriate after the preceding word of Jesus. Special emphasis is laid upon the power of prayer in the reply. They are assured of divine aid and protection; they do not do their work single-handed.

The next group of sections, Secs. 13–17, has to do with the opposition which Jesus met, especially from the Pharisees. This opposition vitally concerned the early Palestinian Christians, who themselves had to bear its brunt. It is interesting that the dominant note of all that is said is the prophetic call to repentance. It is this failure to repent which brings upon "this generation" and its leaders the woes of Jesus. A passionate earnestness is still evident in the words. Q itself must have shared in Paul's yearning for the repentance of Israel, and both only retain some measure of what was a supreme motive

with Jesus. In Sec. 13 the charge that Jesus cast out demons by the power of the prince of demons is met by Jesus himself. Whether Sec. 14 is to be considered as a true parable or has some literal significance is hard to determine. Jülicher[1] interprets it as a parable illustrating vs. 23. His explanation is tempting, and yet it seems more natural to think that Q regarded it as a contrast drawn between the healing of Jewish exorcists and that of Jesus; theirs was merely negative, his filled with the Holy Spirit. The demand for a sign, Sec. 15, is met by the assertion that no sign shall be given except the sign of Jonah. The Ninevites repented at the preaching of Jonah; the Queen of the South journeyed from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon. This generation has for its guidance what is greater than the preaching of Jonah or the wisdom of Solomon—Jesus and his message. What they need is not signs, but eyes to see. Then follows Jesus' denunciation of the Pharisees and their false piety, of the scribes and their selfish leadership, and of this hardened generation which has no ear for the

[1] *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, p. 238.

message of the prophet in their midst. The judgment of God awaits them.

After this, attention naturally turns again to the disciples, but this time it is words of warning and encouragement which are spoken. Sec. 17 warns them of dangers that they must face but assures them of God's care over them. From this section on, attention focuses more and more upon the kingdom and the coming day of the Son of Man. In Sec. 18 the disciples are instructed to seek the kingdom and leave all else to God. "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom." Then come, Sec. 19, parables urgently emphasizing the need of watchfulness for the coming of the Son of Man.

What does the coming of the Son of Man mean? It means, Sec. 20, the kindling of a terrible fire. Jesus has a fearful baptism with which to be baptized. A period of strife is at hand. It means also, Secs. 21, 22, 23,[1] a judgment. It is urged that the interval is very short, and another earnest appeal is made to the people to repent. The

[1] Arguments for assigning Secs. 21 and 23 to Q are presented on pp. 169 ff. It is not necessary for present purposes to ascribe them to Q.

judgment is at hand. What is the kingdom? is asked in Sec. 24, and the answer is that it is something hidden and secret now but it shall be revealed in great power and glory. Who shall share in the kingdom? is the question propounded in Sec. 25. Only those who are worthy, is the reply; and this means that those Israelites who depend upon their relationship to Abraham are to be rejected and to behold Gentiles in their places. Sec. 26 adds a lament over Jerusalem, the people forsaken of God. There is no reference here to the destruction of the city. It is the condemnation of God upon it which is presented. The tender note that can be felt in every word spoken in condemnation of Isarel ought to be noticed. It is in this connection that the full meaning of Sec. 27 to the early Christians appears. To come out from Judaism and be followers of Jesus had literally meant the breaking of home ties, the abandonment, now of father or mother, now of son or daughter. But this they are told is the price Jesus expected them to pay.

The question where and when the day of the Son of Man is to be is then asked, Sec. 29. But no

answer is given to their questions. All searching for outward signs is condemned. They will know the place when the time comes to know. The whole world will know, for it will be as the lightning, visible from the one end of the heavens to the other. They are to be ready at all times, for it will be a day of judgment from which there can be no escape. With Sec. 30 the source Q most appropriately closes. Their Lord has given his disciples their commission. Let each man do his duty and he shall enter into the joy of his Lord, when he comes in his glory.

There is left unaccounted for that group of mere fragments, Sec. 28, which Luke has unsuccessfully attempted to adjust to other material here introduced. Is this an instance of that phenomenon with which the Old Testament has made us familiar—a group of sayings, too precious to be lost, added at the end of the whole? No other explanation so well fits the facts of the case. What would be more natural than that sayings of Jesus deemed too precious to be lost should be appended at the close of a writing that assumed to give the Lord's teachings! The peculiar conflation we

find in chaps. 16 and 17 of Luke is thus satisfactorily explained. In the source this section must then have followed Sec. 30; the position of these sayings in Luke is determined by the other material he has here inserted.[1]

Disregarding then this section, which may properly be looked upon as an appendix, surely we have in this common material of Matthew and Luke something more than a heap of ruins. It has a plan and an intelligible order; further study of the standpoint of Q may cause us to revise much here presented, but it is hard to see how anyone can question that there is a real consistency and completeness in this material. It must also be borne in mind that Q is only known to us in the versions of Matthew and Luke; and what is most characteristic of the source is just what has been obscured by the later editors. Every effort ought to be made to avoid any forced interpretations, but is there not a plan and sequence here in the material as it stands? There is no need of any scheme of our own contriving; room may freely be left for difference of interpretation. We need

[1] For the arrangement of this material in Luke see pp. 175 f.

only accept the order of Luke as a reliable witness for the order of his source[1] and to omit only what Matthew has omitted.[2] Then, and not until then, does the general scheme which we have outlined appear. This shows also that it is not Luke's creation. Luke has tried to convert this topical into a chronological sequence. Some of his insertions can be explained in no other way, and the introductory settings that he has supplied point to the same conclusion.

Have we not now the keystone in place which gives binding force to all the arguments previously presented? Proof has been given of close literary resemblance in most of the material and striking similarity of thought in all of it. When to this is added a plausible explanation of how the variations in the two versions have arisen and an exposition of the self-consistency and unity of the material, then surely the existence of the source Q can no longer be questioned, and there is good

[1] And it is necessary only to assume that this is substantially correct.

[2] Secs. 9 and 23 were added above only for the sake of completeness, because the evidence is so strong that they belong to Q.

reason to believe that we are on the right way to its reconstruction.

We have shown that one does not need to add anything to the common material to make it a unit. This is a strong presumption in itself against finding extensive omissions on the part of Matthew or Luke which ought to be added to the source Q. But before discussing the relation of Q to this independent material of Matthew and Luke in detail, there are certain other general considerations, favoring the practical completeness of what these evangelists give in common, which should be mentioned. From the start it ought to be remembered that in just so far as we expand the limits of this source we increase the difficulty of accounting for its becoming lost as an independent document. And again the great respect which both evangelists show for it is against any considerable omissions. The temptation to so many investigators in this field has been to include in Q more or less of the rich material peculiar to Luke, but it is just in this direction that one needs to be on one's guard. Matthew omits almost nothing from Mark. Would he make such extended omissions from

that source which, it is possible at least, gave his Gospel its name? It is true that while Luke seems to have shown a higher regard for Q than for Mark, the reverse seems to be the case in respect to Matthew. Nevertheless, the First Gospel has preserved Q very faithfully; this is assured by the close literary relationship between Matthew and Luke in all of this material—much closer than in what they both give from Mark. Another important consideration is that the common material is, as we have tried to show, self-consistent and complete in itself. One needs to add nothing from either Gospel to make it a unit.

The only serious argument against this which has been presented is that Q includes narratives, that it presupposes a knowledge of the works of Jesus, that it has a historical introduction. It must therefore have been a Gospel rather than a collection of sayings, it is held. All recognize that Q contains narratives, but in every case the narrative is subordinated to the teaching. Jesus did not preach a series of sermons which needed only to be collected into a book. The narrative and circumstantial character that clings to some of this

material is not an evidence of a dramatic historical purpose, but only of its primitive character. Some of the soil still clings to these sayings, showing whence they were dug. If the opposing argument is to have any force it ought to be shown that the narrative material is secondary to the sayings. But there is only one section in which this possibility has been cogently suggested, and that is in Sec. 4; and yet if it could be proved in this one case, the great importance attached to the saying here might account for the exception. In truth, however, the grounds for regarding this narrative as a later addition are inconclusive; it furnishes strong indications of its primitive character.[1] Nowhere else is there the slightest ground for regarding the narrative as secondary.

It is also true that Q has a historical introduction in Secs. 1 and 2. A historical introduction might imply a historical conclusion. It is certainly the unexpected to find a primitive Christian writing with so little about the death and resurrection of Jesus. Here there is no mention of the resurrection and but slight reference to the Passion and

[1] See above, p. 40.

death. It may be that the death was not even explicitly mentioned. Luke 14:27 could refer to it only indirectly. Luke 12:49, 50 and 17:25 are not in Matthew. But Luke 11:47 ff. and 13:34 indicate that Jesus must share the fate of the prophets who have gone before. The shadow of the cross can be observed in all the later sections of Q, but this is only because it is inherent in the material itself. The only way in which any account of Jesus' death and resurrection can be ascribed to Q is to assign to that source material which Matthew has omitted, for it is evident that Matthew has no primitive source for the Passion and resurrection besides Mark, whom he follows closely. Luke on the other hand certainly has.[1]

F. C. Burkitt in his recent book, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, favors the view that this independent information was obtained from Q, and Harnack allows the possibility but does not approve of it. Both B. Weiss and J. Weiss have long supported this theory. The outstanding objection to it is the fact that not a trace of its

[1] An alternative possibility, improbable as it is, should be mentioned, i.e., that Mark's account came from Q. The relation of Q to Mark will be considered later.

influence appears in Matthew. How strange that he should have felt the need of weaving the Q version of the calumny of the Pharisees and of the sending forth of the disciples into the corresponding narrative of Mark, but that when he came to the most important matter of all, the account of the Passion, he should ignore this source entirely! He takes pains to add the few late apocryphal bits of information which come to him but omits all reference to this rich material that Luke is supposed to have found in Q. Even a superficial study of the First Gospel ought to make it clear that the only reliable source for the narrative of Jesus' life which that evangelist possesses is Mark.[1] These outstanding considerations far outweigh all subterranean threads of connection which may be found between this independent material of Luke and Q. In fact, however, no one supporting this view has as yet taken the trouble to point out such threads of connection if there are any. The only resemblance that is apparent is that in Luke 22:35–39, where 22:35 seems to be a direct refer-

[1] The possibility that he had sources of Mark is to be left open; whether Q could be one of such sources will be considered later.

ence to 10:4, but it must be remembered that, if in Luke's source terms different from what Luke had himself previously used had really stood, that evangelist would have been constrained to conform them to 9:3 or 10:4. No theories can be built upon this likeness. Surely the general character of this independent Passion material of Luke is much more closely related to the narratives peculiar to Luke that have preceded than to the common material of Q. Such historical notes as 8:2, 3; 13:31–33 seem closely akin.

It is this lack of any positive foundation which outweighs any expectation one might have that such an account would follow in Q. The evidence of the Gospels themselves opposes it. When also we examine this expectation itself we see that it rests upon slight foundations. Q was not written for missionary purposes. Knowledge of the general outline of Jesus' life was taken for granted. It was written for the benefit of the early Christian community, furnishing them a collection of the teachings of Jesus with their special problems and difficulties in mind. While from this standpoint a historical introduction was not necessary, still it was

not inappropriate. Such a collection of Jesus' teachings could very properly begin with a presentation of the divine authority and power of the teacher, and this is all we have a right to *demand*.

If we may judge anything of the sequence of events in the life of Christ from Mark it is true that there is some recognition of the same sequence in Q also. Q begins with the Baptist, implies a successful ministry culminating in the joy of Jesus at the return of the disciples; then the gradual opposition which developed is set forth. The tone of the sayings grows more and more somber and the later sayings are dominantly eschatological. This is a general trend that we recognize in Mark also and probably rests on real historical remembrance. But again there is no reason why a collection of Jesus' teachings should not preserve in broad outlines the sequence they had in the life of Jesus.

Such a question as this cannot, however, be decided by general considerations. A closer examination must be made into the special material of Matthew and Luke and its relation to that which they have in common, and the relation of Q to Mark must also be considered. But in view of the

general arguments which have been presented, we shall not approach these questions from the standpoint of Wendt, who assigned to Q whatever he could not find sufficient reason for putting elsewhere. Good grounds will be demanded for any section to be included in Q besides the common material.

CHAPTER V

RELATION OF THE COMMON SOURCE TO THE INDEPENDENT MATERIAL OF LUKE

What did Luke retain from Q which Matthew omits? In discussing Sec. 1 we have already seen that 3:10–16*a* cannot belong to Q, and this may be taken as a typical insertion of Luke added in a characteristic manner. Luke 3:19, 20 may come from some special source of Luke, but it is only a summary of what Mark says in 6:17 ff. The genealogy which follows the account of Jesus' baptism could not have stood in the same source that Matthew used. This same argument applies of course to the birth narratives of chaps. 1 and 2. Wellhausen has given plausible reasons for believing that Luke had a source originally written in Semitic for the material which he combines with Mark's account of the rejection at Nazareth, chap. 4. But there is no reason why this may not have been true of other sources of Luke besides Mark and Q. Some of the most striking Semiticisms of Luke are found in chaps. 1 and 2, which

Matthew cannot have known. There is not the slightest reason for assigning any part of 4:16 ff. to Q. In this passage there is an interest in the widow and the outcast, like that in 3:10–15, which we shall find characteristic of Luke. The miraculous draught of fishes in chap. 5 has no point of contact with Q. In the Sermon on the Mount, Sec. 3, we have given reasons for regarding 6:24–26 as an addition of Luke. Whether Luke has made any additions in Sec. 4 is doubtful. This was shown in our previous discussion. Luke 7:11–17 would certainly not have been omitted by Matthew if he knew it. Its insertion by Luke, like that of 7:21, is readily understood; it prepares the way for 7:22. That Matthew and Luke supply this deficiency in such different ways shows that they are not here following their common source.

Besides the mere editorial insertions in Sec. 5 we have the interesting addition of 7:29, 30. The context shows that they are not original here.[1] But they might still be a misplaced saying of Q. That this is a genuine word of Jesus is made more probable by the fact that in Matt. 21:32 we have

[1] See p. 44.

the same thought; but the entirely different language in which they express the saying indicates that they found it in no common written source, but rather in common tradition. Luke follows this section with the narrative of the sinful woman at the house of Simon the Pharisee. But it is only in Luke's addition, 7:29, 30, that the contrast is drawn between the outcasts and the Pharisees. It is not found in Q at all, and here again it is the characteristic Lukan type of material. Chapter 8 begins with the valuable historical notice about the women who minister to Jesus. But it is Luke and not Q who shows special knowledge of the women followers of Jesus. It is he and not Q who shows himself well informed regarding Herod.[1]

With 9:51 the second great interpolation of Luke begins. The whole is represented as taking place on a journey to Jerusalem, 9:51–53; 13:22, 33; 17:11; 18:31; 19:11, 28. Samaria has already been reached in 9:51; in 13:31 they are in the territory of Herod, but they are still passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee in 17:11. The next geographical notice, 18:35, places

[1] Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, is mentioned.

Jesus and his disciples at Jericho, where Mark's itinerary is again resumed. The background for this period is vaguely thought to be the general region of southern Galilee and Samaria, and possibly Perea.[1] The journey toward Jerusalem seems to be merely an artificial scheme for giving a sort of unity to the whole. Luke found 9:51–56 in some source or tradition and used it as an introductory setting for this Q material, which had no background. Here was a reference to messengers whom Jesus sent before him, 9:52. These were regarded as the disciples mentioned in Q's account of 10:1 ff. Disciples were everywhere mentioned in Q in a sense which implied more than the Twelve. Matt. 9:57–62, for which Matthew had found an appropriate setting when Jesus crossed over to the east shore of the Sea of Galilee, Luke regarded as a reference to this momentous journey toward Jerusalem. All that followed in Q was made to fit into this situation. Here and there narratives were added to give the whole section more of a historical tone. The question of the lawyer and the parable of the Good Samaritan,

[1] See below, p. 177.

which really imply a Judean setting, were put here probably because of the reference to the Samaritan; and the visit at the house of Mary and Martha was no doubt put here as a companion piece of the answer to the lawyer. The hearing of the word was thus co-ordinated with works of charity. Neither of these additions, 10:25–42, stood in the Q which Matthew read. They are here only because of 9:51–56, which provides the Samaritan background. If Q's account of the sending forth of the disciples already had this entirely different setting from that of Mark, chap. 6, it is more probable that Matthew would have left them separate.

In 10:17–20 Luke gives an account of the return of the disciples, which there is every reason to believe stood in Q. Matthew has omitted it because he has added to Q here so much later material having to do with the disciples' mission after the death of Jesus. The account of the return was no longer appropriate. The thought here is closely related to Luke 11:20 ff. The success of their mission means the overthrow of the kingdom of Satan.

The parable which Luke has given in the midst of the discourse on prayer also probably stood in Q. Why Matthew should omit it is evident. It has no proper place in the Sermon on the Mount. Wendt's *Die Lehre Jesu*, p. 99, has pointed out that the very verse of the following saying, which Luke has altered, in its Matthean form seems closely related to this parable. Matt. 7:9, τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν,[1] is the same form of question that we have in Luke 11:5, and bread, the first thing asked for in 7:9, completes the connection with the parable which in Luke precedes. The fact that Luke has here changed the form of the question adds to the significance of this similarity. Another linguistic relation to Q is in the word χρῄζει, found only in Matt. 6:32; Luke 12:30, and twice in Paul. We may therefore with some probability assign this parable to Q and account for Lukan characteristics as due to his stylistic changes.

Luke's addition of 11:27, 28 is more doubtful. Just as Mark had a passage dealing with Jesus' family immediately after the calumny of the

[1] This phrase is found elsewhere, Luke 14:38; 15:4; 17:7; Matt. 12:11. Whether all these passages belong to Q is doubtful.

Pharisees, the same might be true of Q. But, on the other hand, not only is the language here strongly Lukan, but the truly feminine interest of the saying belongs to what is most characteristic of the Third Gospel. It is also to be remembered that Luke was familiar with Mark, and under the influence of that Gospel may have inserted this parallel to Mark 3:31–35 in the corresponding context. Mark 3:31–35 itself he had already quoted. However, the possibility may be left open that this saying was in Q and that Matthew in conflating this section with Mark omitted it.

Additional material is again found in Luke 12: 13–21. It consists of two distinct portions, the question in regard to an inheritance, vss. 13, 14, and the parable of the Rich Fool, vss. 16–20. Here again omission by Matthew could be readily understood, for he has incorporated the sayings here into the Sermon on the Mount. But there can be no question that the connection between Luke 12:12 and 12:22 is as good, if not better, without this long insertion. The application, vs. 15, which is given to the question about inheritances is strictly Lukan[1] in its interest, and the parable

[1] This does not necessarily mean that the application was not made by Jesus himself.

which follows belongs to the same group as those which are added in Luke, chap. 16. Furthermore, when the two versions of the sayings that follow are compared, it appears that there also the general principle of Matt. 6:19 is in Luke a concrete, definite rule, "Sell what you have and give alms." This danger of covetousness was to Luke a very threatening one, and he may well have desired to strengthen the force of Jesus' words here by this special material, which undoubtedly rests upon reliable tradition. Surely it is the safer principle to leave sayings that show the characteristic Lukan standpoint to Luke, when the context favors the view that they are an insertion and they have not the support of Matthew.

Luke 12:35–38 is a parable emphasizing the need of watching, which is not found in Matthew. It has, however, some features related to Matthew's parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins.[1] Verse 37*b* here introduces an allegorizing feature which is a favorite of Luke. The messianic meal is

[1] Wellhausen and others have made much of this resemblance, but it does not include any of the essential features and is not linguistic. The resemblances which Jülicher finds to Mark 13:33–37 are more interesting. Wellhausen finds in 12:35, ἀναλύω, a trace of a Semitic original. This would at least indicate that Luke had some written source here.

certainly intended by it. But the fact that this allegorical feature is here so entirely out of place distinguishes the parable itself from Luke's characteristic material. Matthew might omit it because of the other parables which he adds in this connection and which to him would be much more significant.

In 13:1–9 Luke has a call to repentance based on two Jerusalem disasters and a parable of a Fig Tree, teaching how short an interval for repentance is left. In the context from Q in which these stand they are most fitting. Luke 12:54–58 is likewise a call to repentance; the same earnest, almost passionate, tone is continued here. The passage is unusually free from Lukan literary changes. It is strikingly Semitic in language, and, what is more important, several of these Semiticisms relate it to Q. In 13:4, *ἐφ' οὓς . . . . αὐτούς*, and in 13:9, *ποιήσῃ καρπόν*, remind us strongly of the preaching of John the Baptist on this same theme of repentance. See Matt. 3:12. Compare also Luke 6:43. Even more striking, perhaps, is *ὀφειλέται* = *ḥayyabh*, a term which Luke has avoided in 11:4, but which Matthew has retained in 6:9 ff.

This literary evidence in connection with the striking kinship in thought gives us sufficient justification for regarding it as a part of Q. Possibly the similarity of this parable to Mark's account of the cursing of the fig tree may account for Matthew's omission here. Luke inserts this parable but omits Mark 11:12 ff. Matthew may on similar grounds have chosen to retain Mark 11:12 ff. and to omit this passage. The omission remains, however, difficult to understand.

Luke 13:10–17 is another passage found only in Luke. J. Weiss has argued that Luke could not have inserted it here. It is so entirely out of place, he says, that unless Luke found it already in this context he would certainly have placed it somewhere else. But someone did place it here, and it is surely easier to attribute the insertion to one who did not have the original author's sequence of thought in mind than to that author himself. No such inharmonious insertion is found anywhere in the material which both Matthew and Luke contain. Narratives are found in Q but the emphasis is upon the teaching; in this narrative the teaching is secondary and is not akin to anything we

have in the common material. Luke, we have already seen, has broken up the topical sequence here and converted it into a chronological one. Who would be more likely to introduce such a narrative as this? Moreover, the incident in this connection has its justification to Luke because of what Jesus replies to Herod in 13:32, another passage found only in Luke.

Luke 13:31–33, to which attention has just been called, is probably also an addition of the evangelist. It converts the merely topical relation of 13:30 to 13:34 into a historical one. This insertion is very helpful in showing the purpose and method of Luke's additions. We are also reminded that Luke is the evangelist who seems particularly interested in Herod and best informed concerning him.[1]

Throughout chaps. 14, 15, and 16 of Luke the condemnation of the Pharisees and exaltation of the publicans and sinners is the main theme. We would therefore expect to find more of his characteristic material here than elsewhere. In 14:1–24 Luke gives a series of three parables preceded

[1] The saying of Jesus in this passage shows, however, that it is no composition of Luke, but comes from some source or tradition.

by a healing, all connected as a scene at the table in the house of a Pharisee. The last, the parable of a Great Feast, as has already been said, is so different in language and development of thought from Matthew's parable on the same theme that a common literary source is improbable.[1] We have no other example of such freedom in treating the sayings of Q as one must assume to assign these two accounts to that source. What likeness there is, is far more readily accounted for by a common tradition; this there must have been if, as seems true, the parable had an authentic basis. Another resemblance to this insertion of Luke has been found in Matt. 12:11, 12=Luke 14:5. But the fact that Luke has presented this conception in two different versions, 13:15 and 14:5, and that Matthew is as much like one as the other, would show that it was a widespread traditional saying. The probability remains that we have here not Q material but an insertion of Luke. There is also a parallel to Luke 14:8–11 appended to Matt. 20:28 in Codd. D, ϕ, Old Latin, Vulg., and

[1] The likenesses and differences are fully presented in Harnack, p. 119.

Syr. Cur. The MSS evidence for this addition is about the same as that which we found for 16:2*b*, 3, but the passage is very clumsily appended and it is more doubtful whether it really belo ngs to Matthew. The resemblance here to Luke is like that which we have found in Matthew's parallels to the rest of this chapter. The language throughout is entirely different. There can hardly be the same literary source behind this passage and Luke 14:8–11; so that whether or not this be regarded as belonging to Matthew, it only confirms our view that, in this material connected with a feast at the house of a Pharisee, Luke gives us a well-known tradition and is not using any document known to Matthew. The First Gospel shows familiarity with some of this material but in a form different from that of Luke.

The two parables of Luke 14:28–33 are wanting in Matthew. Their connection with the preceding sayings is, as Jülicher says, "ausgezeichnet." That Luke should have found these two parables of so little suggestiveness apart from their context and inserted them here shows far more aptness than he has elsewhere displayed in his combinations of

sayings. He has not Matthew's skill in such readjustment. Nor is it surprising that they are omitted by Matthew. They are mere illustrations, adding nothing to the teaching of 10:37, 38, and they would be very unsuitable for Matthew's already lengthy discourse of chap. 10. And so, despite the fact that we have no literary resemblances to which to point, it is probable that these verses belong to Q. The section is concluded in Luke by the parable on Salt. Jülicher[1] has given good reasons for regarding 14:34, 35 as the proper conclusion here, and vs. 33 as only an editorial addition. Matthew already has his version of this parable in 5:13, which is certainly secondary, whether or not it is linguistically dependent upon this passage.

Luke, chap. 15, continues the condemnation of the Pharisees and emphasizes God's concern for the lost. That Matthew knew the parable of the Prodigal Son and omitted it is almost impossible to believe. But, as we have seen, the parable of the Sheep seems to have been appended to Q and so is found in Matthew also. The question then arises

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 70.

whether the parable of the Lost Coin, its companion piece, was not there. One recognizes that Matthew could not so readily adapt this to the application he has given the preceding parable. It may therefore have been in Q. There is little evidence upon which to decide either way.

The two parables of Luke, chap. 16, are likewise directed against the Pharisees, and to Luke, at least, they attach a real moral value to poverty. Into this independent material of chaps. 15 and 16 Luke has woven several sayings from that miscellaneous group with which Q probably closed. It is interesting to compare and see how much more successful Matthew was in this respect. The rest of this group Luke simply adds at the beginning of chap. 17 without any attempt to correlate them. Is 17:7–10 to be included in this group? It is indeed possible. Such a parable Matthew might have passed over, as he certainly did others like it. Nor does it contain any of the characteristics that so readily differentiate special material of Luke.

Luke 17:11–19 is another miracle giving us practically the same geographical setting which we had in 9:51 ff. These indications of a Samaritan

ministry belong to the peculiarities of Luke. He has very clumsily woven the Q material into the background it gives, and tried to adapt the whole to the framework of Mark. In 18:35 Jesus is in Jericho, which implies that he came south by way of the Jordan and Perea, Mark 10:1. Either Luke shows complete ignorance of the geography here or he understands all the possessions of Herod Antipas, including Perea, under the term "Galilee." In 3:1 Herod is called Tetrarch of Galilee. This would explain why Galilee should be mentioned in 17:11 after the repeated reference to the journey southward.

In 18:1–14 are two parables inserted by Luke. The purpose of their insertion here is to show the great need of prayer and faith to hasten the time of the Parousia. The second parable surely had no such significance originally, and neither did the first if we regard vss. 1–5 as giving its primitive form. The emphasis in vss. 6–8*a* upon the demand for vengeance cannot be attributed to Luke, who, in vs. 1 and the connection with the following parable, shows that he found its point in the persistent prayer. The eschatological

application, therefore, must have been already added in the source where Luke found it. The fact that the preceding section from Q touched upon the theme of the final judgment might suggest that the connection had already been made in Q. But 17:22 ff. is concerned with the coming of Christ in judgment. This parable speaks of the judgment of God. Besides, the judgment is never presented in Q as a time of vengeance upon enemies; it is always referred to in personal words of warning. If this parable stood in Q it was added by a later hand. What relations it originally had to 11:5–8 can no longer be determined. The application of vss. 6–8*a* is very old, Jewish rather than Christian. Certainly there are few who would be willing to say with Wellhausen that this is the original of the earlier parable. Luke certainly did not find it in connection with 11:5–8. Either it was an early addition here in Q or Luke has inserted it from another source for the reason we gave in the beginning. The second parable was probably added by Luke. With 18:15 Luke returns to Mark, whom he follows thenceforth, though he shows acquaintance with independent sources. The only pas-

sage after this which can with any confidence be assigned to Q is the parable of the Pounds, 19:12 ff. Luke explains in 19:11 why he has reserved it for this place. Just as Jesus is about to enter Jerusalem gives him the historical setting he desires.

There is a slight resemblance to Matthew in Luke 22:30*b* = Matt. 19:28*b* and a reference to Q (Luke 10:4) in 22:35. These are, however, of very little weight; the first resemblance can be readily understood without the assumption of a common written source, and Luke would have conformed 22:35 to 10:4 or 9:3 if it had been different in his source. For the reasons already given we would not assign any of Luke's Passion material to Q.

In conclusion, we now have found good reason for assigning 10:17–20; 11:5–8; 13:1–9; 14:28–35 to Q. To this list three other passages might be added as possibly belonging to Q, 12:35–38; 15:8–10; 17:7–10. Minor additions of Luke considered in the detailed discussions of pp. 19–119 are as follows: a few additions in Luke 6:27 ff.; 7:2 ff. (?); 9:61, 62; 12:1*b*, 32, 49, 50; 13:25(?); 17:20, 21, 25, 28–30. It was left doubtful whether

11:34–36, 12:54–56 are to be regarded as having a parallel in Matthew. The evidence is not equally strong for them all, but they may with some confidence be assigned to Q.

Many insertions have evidently been made into the Q material by Luke. J. Weiss has long championed the view that these had already been added to Q before Luke used it. We have seen that in a few cases such a pre-Lukan addition seemed possible. But if there is anything which may be regarded as characteristic of the third evangelist himself, it is to be found in the manner of insertion and standpoint of this additional material. This is also the conclusion of Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage*, pp. 83–88. Whether Luke had one or more independent sources is beyond the scope of this discussion. Some of this Lukan material was indirectly known to Matthew. Evidently in the time of Luke and Matthew there existed a body of narratives and sayings connected with Jesus which had not been incorporated in Mark or Q. We have seen how there was a tendency to append such additional sayings to Q. The fact, however, that the most careful examina-

tion of all later Christian literature has failed to disclose more than a few fragmentary doubtful passages indicates that Matthew and Luke have given us practically all of this extra material then accessible. From this point of view, also, it is improbable that either evangelist made such considerable omissions from his sources as many have supposed.

CHAPTER VI

RELATION OF THE COMMON SOURCE TO THE INDEPENDENT MATERIAL OF MATTHEW

In our previous study of Matthew and his methods we saw that he has either woven all of his non-Markan material into the narrative of Mark or attached it to one of his great discourses. His method necessitated the frequent transference of sayings from their original sequence. This has made the problem of sources in Matthew much more difficult. When we have not the parallel material of Luke to guide us we have nothing by which to judge except the content of the saying or narrative in question. However, the nature of some of Matthew's independent material is such that we can confidently say that it never stood in Q. The narratives peculiar to Matthew at once differentiate themselves as somewhat legendary, and it is there that the linguistic characteristics of Matthew are most manifest. What Hawkins[1] says of chaps. 1 and 2 applies to all of these narra-

[1] *Hor. Syn.*, pp. 8, 9.

tives. It is very probable that Matthew had no written sources at all for most of them: chaps. 1, 2; 3:14, 15; 14:28–31; 17:24–27; 21:14–16; 27:3–10, 19, 51*b*–53, 62–66; 28:2, 3, 9–20. Surely none of these narratives came from Q.

Some of the additional material of Matthew is merely editorial; this is certainly true of the Old Testament quotations, 4:13–16; 8:17; 12:17–21; 13:14, 15. Among the editorial additions may also be included those passages in non-Markan contexts in which Matthew has anticipated or repeated sayings and narratives from Mark.[1] Matt. 4:23–25 = Mark 3:17 ff.; Matt. 5:29, 30 = Mark 9:43 ff.; Matt. 6:14, 15 = Mark 11:25; Matt. 9:27–31 = Mark 10:46–52; Matt. 9:35, 36 = Mark 1:39; Matt. 6:34; 10:39–42 = Mark 8:35; 9:37, 41; Matt. 11:14 = Mark 9:11 ff. Probably 10:17–22 (23?) is also to be included in this list, though more can be said in this case for the view that Matthew is here using some source of Mark. Matt. 10:39–42 is interesting because it is surely an editorial addition, and not only illustrates Matthew's readiness to use Markan material

[1] This has been fully discussed, pp. 58 ff.

twice but gives us something of the editor's own standpoint. Matthew's strong interest in the later church, its discipline, and organization is here apparent. It is only natural to expect that since Matthew has used passages from Mark in this way, he has used some from Q in like manner. Matt. 9:32–34; 12:33–37 have been considered as such Q passages used by Matthew a second time editorially. The additions which Matthew has made to the Beatitudes, 5:4, 7–9, may also be merely editorial, but their close relation to the Old Testament and rabbinic teaching is not inconsistent with their being genuine words of Jesus. Moreover, they are not the sort of passages Matthew was accustomed to quote from the Old Testament. It is therefore more likely that they had some basis in tradition.

Passages showing marked interest in the organization and discipline of the church may also with much probability be assigned to the editor. It does not follow that he composed them; more probably they rest upon good tradition or special sources. Among these must be included 7:15; 13:24–30, 36–43, 51, 52; 16:17–20; 18:17–20; 19:10–12.

The parable of the Dragnet, 13:47–50, seems to be a companion piece to the parable of the Tares, and belongs to the same source.

There is another group of passages in Matthew which give the First Gospel its characteristic quality. Their dominant interest is in practical Christian morality and forms of worship. This higher Christian righteousness is contrasted with that of the Pharisees: 5:17 (18, 19), 20–24, 27, 28, 33–37[1]; 6:1–8, 16–18; 12:5–7, 11, 12; 23:2, 3, 7*b*–12. There can be no doubt that these rest upon genuine words of Jesus, but they are presented from a characteristically Matthean standpoint. It can be argued that these passages were omitted from Q by Luke because his gentile readers would not be interested in them. But they are much more closely related to the preceding group with its strong church interest than to Q. One needs only to separate 5:17 ff. from the material common to Luke 6:20 ff. to see how far different in interest this material is from Q. The woes of chap. 23 which are peculiar to Matt. 23:15–22, 24 and 15:12–14 seem to be related to this same group.

[1] Additions from Q and Mark are evident in 5:18, 25, 26, 29–32.

All of these passages can with some assurance be denied a place in Q and with them may be included most of the parables peculiar to Matthew. The very fact that Luke gives the parable of 22:1–14 in an independent form shows that it did not belong to Q. It is also very hard to believe that Luke would have omitted 21:28–31 had he known it. He has given 21:32 (Luke 7:29, 30) in a different form. As 25:31–46 stands in Matthew it can hardly have belonged to Q. It is much more closely related to Matthew's characteristic material. Matt. 25:1–13 seems also to be a parable from independent sources which Matthew has added to the group of Sec. 19. It may be that Luke was familiar with it in some variant form.[1] The possibility that 18:23–35; 20:1–16 came from Q cannot be denied, and yet there is very little reason for assigning them to Q if once it is agreed that Matthew had access to some valuable parables which were not given by Mark nor Q.

More can be said for the parables of the Pearl and the Hidden Treasure, 13:44–46, which have even impressed a critical scholar like Wernle as

[1] See p. 98.

belonging to the common material of Matthew and Luke. Why the latter should omit it cannot be said; but then we cannot expect to know every motive which prompted him. Such sayings as 5:41; 6:34; 18:10 might easily have been dropped by Luke; 7:6 (–?); 10:5, 6, 16*b* would naturally have been omitted by him. Even the Matthean Beatitudes, 5:4, 7, 8–10, might possibly have stood in some other connection in Q, but this is improbable. Matt. 5:13–16 is an editorial compilation; 5:13 is a secondary form of Luke 14:34, 35 (Q), and 5:15 of Mark 4:21. Matt. 5:14, which is found only here, Matthew certainly found in some source, and, as Harnack suggests, it may have been Q. 11:28–30 is a very puzzling addition of Matthew. It shows none of the special characteristics of that evangelist. The only reasons for denying that it stood in Q are the position which it has, displacing a saying that must have belonged in Q, and the difficulty of imagining why Luke should leave it out.

In conclusion, the following sayings may be given a place in Q with more or less probability: 5:14, 41; 6:34; 7:6 (?); 10:5, 6, 16*b;* 13:44–46; 18:10. Whether 6:22, 23; 10:24, 25 have parallels

in Luke was left doubtful, so that may also be included here. Some of the other parables and such sayings as 5:4, 7, 8–10; 11:28–30 could possibly have stood in Q, but it remains improbable. We ought also to notice how relatively small is the amount of valuable information which Matthew possessed outside of Mark and Q. These are his two great sources. Although the First Gospel contains other important material, it is the Third Gospel which contains the richest body of independent narrative and teachings.

The total number of verses from the independent material of Matthew and Luke, which can with any confidence be assigned to Q, does not amount to more than fifty. The omissions of Matthew bulk much larger than those of Luke, but they are mostly illustrative in character and add but little to the teaching. There is a possibility that other sayings and parables also belonged to Q, but in view of the considerations suggested at the beginning we do not consider that they were many.

CHAPTER VII

RELATION OF THE COMMON SOURCE TO MARK

One other relationship demands consideration. Bernhard Weiss, followed by his son, Johannes Weiss, and by B. W. Bacon in a somewhat different form, argues that Mark was familiar with Q and dependent upon it. Thus these scholars would account for coincident variations of Matthew and Luke in Markan material. On the other hand, Wellhausen has argued for the dependence of Q upon Mark, and Jülicher has agreed with him in so far as to say that in the form which Matthew and Luke knew Q it had been influenced by Mark. Harnack in his treatise on this subject has cogently argued against the position of Wellhausen and allows only the possibility of an "indirect"[1] relationship between Mark and Q. It is with the first of these positions that we are immediately concerned, for these scholars maintain not only that Mark knew Q but that much of the narrative material of Mark was taken originally from Q. The

[1] See p. 226.

reconstruction of Q which has here been presented leaves no place for such an expansion into an Urevangelium. Fortunately there are some passages that are found in both Mark and Q. Let us examine these points of contact to see what sort of a relationship they presuppose.

Both Mark and Q began with John the Baptist and his preaching. Part of the account which Q gave was paralleled in Mark, Mark 1:7, 8=Matt. 3:11=Luke 3:16. The context in Q makes it certain that Matthew and Luke have not simply added this verse from Mark. It stood in some form in Q also. One sentence of Luke is practically the same as that of Mark, but Matthew remains more independent of Mark. Since we know that both Matthew and Luke had access to Mark, they have in all probability been influenced by him, for it is just in this verse that their verbal agreement throughout this section is broken. Hence at this point it is unnecessary to postulate a literary relationship between Mark and Q. The tendency to harmonization is likewise to be reckoned with. This very verse of Mark is conformed more completely to Matthew and Luke in the D, a, ff. texts.

There must have been a close similarity in thought, but we must remember that this is the one message of the Baptist which would deeply concern all Christians from the beginning. If, as seems probable, "by the Holy Spirit and by fire" in Matthew and Luke is a conflation of Mark and Q, then there was this one considerable difference in thought. Those who make Mark dependent on Q regard it as an editorial change of Mark, but Mark need not have taken it from Q at all. No immediate relation between Mark and Q can be based on this passage.

Both Mark and Q also contained an account of the baptism and temptation of Jesus. What Q gave about the baptism can no longer be determined, so that nothing more about the resemblance here can be said except that both must have contained some mention of the baptism and baptismal vision. The account of the temptation in Mark implies a knowledge of more than is told. Does it imply a knowledge of Q? This is affirmed by B. W. Bacon,[1] who says that the beasts of Mark 1:13 are taken from Ps. 91:13, the same psalm which is

[1] *Beginnings of the Gospel Story*, p. 7.

quoted in Matt. 4:6. But when we remember that this particular verse of the psalm was not given by Q and it is nowhere even implied in the Q account that Jesus was with wild beasts nor comforted by angels,[1] it is hard to see how this can be used as evidence of dependence on Q. In fact nowhere is the radical difference of the two accounts more manifest than just here. The ministering of angels is a temptation in Q (Matt. 4:6; Luke 4:10, 11) which Jesus repels; in Mark it is apparently the indication of his conquest. Surely Q's account did not lie before Mark, but, as we have said, some other detailed version probably did, and we may conjecture that Psalm 91 had a larger place in it. It is to be granted that Q's account of this, like his account of the preaching of John the Baptist, is more primitive and historical[2] than that of Mark.

A more forceful argument for some relationship between Mark and Q can be found in the fact that both take up these same topics in the same

[1] Matt. 4:10*b* is a conflation.

[2] The writer sees no reason to deny that the Q account of the temptation rests on a genuine word of Jesus.

sequence in their introductions. But, as Harnack has suggested, there is a strong probability that this starting-point was fixed in early catechetical tradition, Acts 1:22 and Luke 1:4. If this likeness in order continued it would be significant, but, being found only at the beginning in material which is really a unit, such great weight cannot be given it. That both Matthew and Luke insert the Q material in the same place in Mark gives no additional value to the argument. They would naturally do so under the circumstances, independently of each other. In the setting Matthew and Luke give Sec. 3 there is also some similarity. Both use Mark 3:7 ff. but in such different ways as to show that it is not due to their having the Sermon on the Mount already combined with narrative material of Mark nor to dependence on each other.[1] Such an explanation would create more difficulties than it could solve. In Q the discourse was directed to the disciples and possibly its introduction had some reference to the hill country. Matthew used Mark 3:7 ff. merely to bring before the reader the multitudes who then listened to Jesus, and he

[1] This judgment is confirmed by Allen, *Com.*, p. 70.

placed the discourse at the beginning of the Galilean ministry as the setting forth of the new law. Luke on the other hand takes the whole situation of Mark 3:7 ff. and introduces the discourse at that point. In no case after this do Matthew and Luke connect Q material with the same Markan context, a very significant fact.

In the content of the Sermon on the Mount the following parallel to Mark occurs, Matt. 7:2*b*= Mark 4:24, but surely a similarity in such a short, proverbial saying as this has little, if any, importance. There can be no question of any dependence of Mark upon Q in this whole discourse, nor, on the other hand, can the authenticity of the sayings here attributed to Jesus be reasonably questioned. Mark's summary of Jesus' teaching, 1:15, seems to be merely editorial. B. W. Bacon has also argued that the description of John the Baptist in Sec. 5 underlies the account of Mark 1:1 ff. Mark certainly implies that he knows more about the Baptist than he tells, and what he knows is consistent with what Q gives in Sec. 5, but this is all that can be said. Mark 1:2 B. W. Bacon understands to be added here from Luke 7:27, and

he would explain the coincident omission of Matthew and Luke here as due to their use of Q, Mark's source. But the common explanation of this, as a scribal addition, is a very natural one. Of coincident variations in general we shall have more to say later.

Nowhere is the relation between Mark and Q closer than in the sending forth of the disciples, Mark 6:6*b*–11; Luke 10:1–12, Sec. 7. The directions given to the disciples in the two accounts are in practical agreement. The Q account is fuller, but including all that is found in Mark. Mark's version seems condensed; here also he probably knew more than he told. The exception made of the staff in Mark 6:8 appears to be secondary, and Harnack[1] has completely refuted Wellhausen's argument that Q is dependent on Mark in this section. The priority belongs to Q throughout. But this does not establish Mark's use of Q. We have no right to deny that Jesus sent forth his disciples, as both of these sources maintain. The character of the instructions shows their primitiveness, and we must allow some place

[1] See pp. 212 ff.

for the period of oral tradition. A basis in fact and common oral tradition is the natural, simple, and amply sufficient explanation of the two accounts here.

In Sec. 8 there is one verse which might be regarded as having a parallel in Mark, Luke 10:16 = Mark 9:37. Here again the ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου of Mark 9:37 favors the priority of Q, but dependence of Mark upon Q is very improbable. It is hard to see how two accounts of a common tradition could be more different, if indeed we have here a common tradition.

The petition of the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," Matt. 6:12, Sec. 12, is reflected in Mark 11:25, but, whatever Mark's relation to Q may have been there, there is every probability that he was familiar with this prayer.[1] The distinctive characteristic of this petition in Q is the use of ὀφειλήματα and ὀφείλέται; these, however, do not appear in Mark.

The only other extended likeness between Mark and Q besides the one of Sec. 7 is that which we

[1] Wellhausen's arguments for denying that this prayer is a genuine word of Jesus are arbitrary.

find in Sec. 13. But here any dependence of the one account on the other is impossible; the differences are too fundamental. The charge itself is not the same in both accounts. In Mark, Jesus is accused of being a demoniac, possessed with Beelzebul; in Q it is only said that he drives out demons by the power of Beelzebul. The first argument of Jesus in reply is substantially the same in both, but the method of presentation is very different. The second argument of Q is not found in Mark. The third argument is much changed in Mark. Q's presentation makes ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ, God. The Kingdom of God is contrasted with that of Beelzebul. In Mark, as we should expect from the form of the charge in 3:22, it is Christ who is opposed to Beelzebul. Q here, as usual, deserves the priority, but is it not more probable that the difference arose in the early tradition than that Mark used the account of Q and changed it?[1] Q concluded its account here with the parable of the Seven Other Spirits; Mark with the saying about the unforgivable sin. This Markan saying, 3:28–30, has its

[1] Harnack is correct in saying that Luke 11:23 and Mark 9:40 have no relation to each other. See p. 221.

parallel in Luke 12:10, Q. The difference between the two accounts here (Mark has "sons of men" and Q has the "Son of Man") is easier to understand on the basis of a common Aramaic text or tradition. There is no possible reason for thinking that Mark is dependent on the Greek Q. Furthermore, there can be little question that where the difference is so great as it is here, the use of a common tradition is more probable than any mere translation change. If now this section as a whole is considered, the impression that Mark and Q are two independent embodiments of early apostolic tradition grows into a conviction.

The demand for a sign, Sec. 15, which was surely made more than once in the life of Jesus, is also mentioned in Mark 8:11–13. The accounts are entirely independent; each preserves authentic features omitted by the other.[1]

In Sec. 16, Luke 11:43 is a close parallel to Mark 12:38*b*, 39*a*. If, as most scholars hold, this is merely borrowed from Mark by both Matthew and Luke, then it would not belong to Q at all.

[1] There is little reason to believe that Luke 11:33 stood in Q at all. See p. 66.

But the coincident variation, occurring in the way it does, makes it more probable that the verse stood in Q also. This is not surprising; we should expect some point of contact in two independent accounts of Jesus' condemnation of the Pharisees.

In Sec. 17, Luke 12:1*b* resembles Mark 8:15. Whether this verse stood in Q is very doubtful,[1] but there is a possibility that it did, and it should be included in the list of points of contact. There is also an interesting likeness between Luke 12:3 = Matt. 10:27 and Mark 4:22, but here the difference in form is marked. Another point of contact here is found in Luke 12:8, 9 = Mark 8:38*a*, and yet how different they are! The likeness between Luke 12:11, 12 and Mark 13:11 is closer.

Jülicher[2] has called attention to the relation of Luke 12:35–38, Sec. 19, to Mark 13:33–37. He wishes especially to emphasize the fact that Luke here is not dependent upon Mark, but he also says of Mark, "dass er gerade unsern Matthäus und unsern Lukas benutzt hatte ist nicht erweislich." Q does deserve the priority here, as we have seen

[1] See above, p. 81. [2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 169 f.

to be regularly the case, but no literary relationship can be maintained.

The cursing of the fig tree, Mark 11:12–14, has often been considered as a later development of the parable of the Fig Tree, Luke 13:6–9, Sec. 23. This is very possible, but are we to suppose that Mark with this parable before him deliberately changed it into the miracle of 11:12 ff.? Surely no such theory can command any wide acceptance today. The trustworthiness of the evangelists has been too firmly established. Anyone who will agree with us that this section belongs to Q must grant that here, at least, they are independent of each other. Whatever relation there may be between the parable of Luke and the miracle of Mark belongs to the period of oral tradition.

The parable of the Mustard Seed is given by both Q, Sec. 24, and Mark 4:30–32. Mark emphasizes its being the smallest of seeds. Q speaks of its becoming a tree and of the birds resting on its branches. The expression τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is only found here in Mark. This is the only parable where the likeness between the two sources is noticeable, and here we find nothing convincing.

It is probable that if Mark had known Q he would have retained the reference to the tree just as Matthew did. On the other hand, Q would certainly have mentioned the small size of the mustard seed if he had had Mark before him.

In Sec. 27, if we accept the parables here of Luke as belonging to Q, Luke 14:34, 35 is the same saying which we find in Mark 9:49, 50. The application of the saying in Q is more appropriate and more likely to be original than that of Mark, but this is all that can be said. Another saying here which both give is Luke 14:27 = Mark 8:34. The likeness in this case is close.

The saying about marriage in Sec. 28 is given a suitable setting in Mark but is isolated in Q. In our discussion of this saying we followed the suggestion of Harnack and accepted the form of Matthew, omitting the clause, "saving for the cause of fornication," as that which originally stood in Q. Harnack[1] has argued that this form is preferable to that of Mark. He considers that the connection between Mark 10:1–9 and 10:10–12 is only literary. Mark 10:10 does indeed seem to

[1] See p. 199.

be a very mechanical connecting link, but between the two forms of the saying it is hard to decide; either might be original. The thought is practically the same. Both Q and Mark 9:42 also have a saying of Jesus on giving offense; the thought is again the same but the expression so different that Matthew can place the two side by side, Matt. 18:6, 7. There is another similarity in idea between Luke 17:5, 6 and Mark 11:23, but here the differences far outweigh any likeness.

The eschatological passage of Q, Sec. 29, forms a striking contrast to that of Mark; the whole standpoint is entirely different. An answer to the question, when the Son of Man is to come, is refused in Q, but in Mark it is answered in full apocalyptic detail. J. Weiss[1] has argued that Mark 13:14–20 is dependent upon Luke 17:31–32. His principal reason is that the whole tenor of Mark, chap. 13, implies a world-catastrophe indeed; in 13:24 ff. it is necessary so to regard it. However, it is a commonplace of all apocalyptic literature to confuse the national with the cosmological standpoint, and that is the true explanation of Mark

[1] *Das älteste Evangelium, in loc.*

here. His sources cannot be determined by such discrepancies. This saying is an integral part of Mark's apocalyptic description and that description is not based on Q. Besides, these very verses of Luke may not have stood in Q; we have considered them as a later addition.[1] So 17:33 also we are inclined to regard as a later insertion. The connection in which Matt. 10:39 gives this same verse inclines one strongly to think he simply borrows it from Mark. Matt. 10:38 stood in both Q and Mark. In its Markan context it is followed by the verse in question. Its introduction by Matthew at this point is thus readily explained. This is confirmed by the fact that in the following verses Matthew is certainly following Mark; 10:40 is based on Mark 9:37, and 10:41, 42 is a practical application of Mark 9:41. We cannot be so sure that Luke is simply quoting Mark, but the probability is strong. However, one might grant that this stood in Q and include it among the common sayings.

There is one more of these short sayings which is found in both sources, Matt. 25:29, Sec. 30, and

[1] See pp. 109 ff.

Mark 4:25. It is very appropriate where it stands in Q but is in a miscellaneous collection in Mark. This, however, does not show that he found it in Q.

Of the twenty-six points of contact between Q and Mark, nineteen are short proverbial sayings, practically independent in themselves; material upon which it is most difficult to base any argument for a common source. Besides, of these one is generally regarded as a gloss, Mark 1:2; two others probably did not stand in Q, Mark 4:21 and 8:35. The differences in seven cases are very marked: 9:37; 3:28–30; 4:22; 8:38*a*; 9:42; 10:11, 12; 11:23. This leaves only nine instances in which there is a likeness of form as well as any similarity of thought. But to these nine ought to be added the parable of the Mustard Seed. We found also that in three cases where there is a connection in thought, a comparison of the two accounts shows that Mark must be using another source, 1:12, 13; 3:22 ff.; 11:12–14. We also noticed how radically different are the two sources in Mark, chap. 13, and Luke, chap. 17. If Mark knew these four sections of Q in an independent form, it is probable that he did other portions of Q also. And one

cannot help wondering how Mark ever came to omit the miraculous healing of the centurion's servant if he was familiar with Q. We can readily see why he should omit teachings, but not why he should leave out such a miracle. Surely no argument for a dependence of Mark upon Q can be based upon any resemblances, which may be traced, of Mark to the other common material of Matthew and Luke. It has been a common practice to assign to Q passages in Matthew which are duplicates of Markan sayings, such as Matt. 5: 29, 30, but, as we have seen, duplicates in Matthew do not necessarily mean that he has access to two sources, and certainly no argument for a dependence of Mark on Q can be based upon them.

However, those who have maintained such dependence have not argued from the standpoint of Q but from that of Mark. The theory has its main support in the problems connected with the use which Matthew and Luke make of Mark, and especially their coincident agreements against Mark. In fact only this last consideration can possibly concern us, for Q is a source common to Matthew and Luke, and only evidence which may

point to such a common source has weight. Both Hawkins and Wernle, two most careful investigators, have explained these variations on other grounds. Allen in his recent commentary on Matthew sums up the probable explanations as being: (1) independent revision by Matthew and Luke along the same lines, causing many agreements against Mark; (2) textual correction of Mark; (3) harmonistic revision of Matthew and Luke; (4) Luke's use of Matthew. This last explanation hardly deserves any answer after the comprehensive reply of Wernle.[1] Allen would do far better to expand his second line of argument and recognize that the textual corrections of Mark in the first century would be very different from those which we can trace through the existing manuscripts. They probably included the omission or correction of some Semiticisms, and may well explain the apparent priority of Matthew in such passages as the account of the Syrophoenician woman. Later change in Mark, combined with the other lines of argument, seems to us in every way the most satisfactory explanation of the phenomena that confront us in the use which

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 45–61.

Matthew and Luke make of Mark. It is more in accord with the incidental character of the common variations which are so well distributed over the whole Gospel. We therefore hold that Mark did not use Q, though such an "indirect" relation as that of which Harnack speaks is possible. But there is not need of assuming even such a relation as that, if one grants that there really was a reliable oral tradition in the apostolic church from which both sources drew. This will account for all the phenomena of their relationship. When once the position is accepted that Mark was not dependent on Q, then the main support for any attempt to assign to Q portions of the Markan material is gone. It is true that, as we have supposed in the case of the account of the baptismal vision, both Matthew and Luke might in other cases prefer the form of Mark to that of Q, and so omit Q. But, as Wernle points out, so different is the character of the two sources that there is little, if anything, which with any probability could be assigned to Q, and for want of more positive evidence it is surely safer to hold to the Q, about which we know.

CHAPTER VIII

THE APOSTOLIC ORIGIN OF THE COMMON SOURCE

Can the source Q have come from one of the twelve disciples? Is there anything in this presentation of the person of Jesus or of his teaching which makes it historically impossible to assign it to such an author? As we have reconstructed this source, in content it is not essentially different from that which is presented by Harnack, and with the estimate[1] that he has placed upon this material we find ourselves in practical agreement.

Q is a collection of sayings, written originally in Aramaic. These sayings are adapted to the needs of the early Palestinian church. The source Q was written before, but probably not long before, Mark. As Harnack has said, the independence of Mark from Q is against such a supposition. The accommodation in Q of Jesus' teaching to the needs of the early church is primarily a matter of arrangement and selection. No "tendencies"

[1] See pp. 246 ff.

can be observed. The author is very conservative in his treatment of this body of tradition.

The conception of the person of Jesus here is the same which we find in the speech of Peter, Acts 2: 14–36. The great questions which we associate with Paul are not raised. Jesus is the Messiah. The author prefaces a historical introduction to make this clear. Jesus is more than a prophet; John was the last of the prophets. As the Messiah, the Son, Jesus has brought the disciples a new revelation of God. Jesus is presented as the Messiah already in his earthly life, but his Kingship in its power and glory is to be revealed hereafter. Just so the kingdom is a hidden force now, to be seen in its glory later.[1]

Nothing is more striking in this source than the way in which the kingdom and future coming are stripped of their apocalyptical features and made ethical in their bearing. The future coming is primarily a call to repentance. All interrogations[2]

[1] See Luke 7:28; 11:20; 13:18–21; 13:29.

[2] This generation and its leaders are condemned in forceful terms, but not as enemies; behind these condemnations is the earnest, sympathetic note, calling upon them to repent while there is time.

as to the when and where are repelled. The kingdom itself is a "Gabe" rather than an "Aufgabe," but the two cannot be separated. The task which is laid upon the disciples has likeness to the Father as its aim—this is the solid rock upon which to build. Jesus gives them the knowledge of the Father that makes this possible. But what is the kingdom? It is the heavenly treasure,[1] it is the entrance into the joy of their Lord.[2] As Kaftan has said, defining "kingdom" in the teaching of Jesus, "Gerichtigkeit ist ein Übung in Gott, und das Segen, das Reich, ist in dem Leben in Gott." There is an inner relationship here which is fundamental. In regard to the ethical standards here presented, we can do no better than to quote the words of Harnack: "Taken as a whole, we have here our Lord's own rule of life and all his promises—a summary of genuine ordinances transforming the life such as is not to be found elsewhere in the Gospel."

The Gentiles are recognized in Q. Great importance is given to Jesus' approval of the centurion's faith. But the standpoint of Q is readily

[1] See Matt. 6:19–21. [2] See Matt. 25:21, 23.

observed when, after the words "From the East and the West they shall come and sit at the table with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of God," it puts the lament over Jerusalem, forsaken of God. It was to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" that Jesus came. Yet here again there is every reason to believe that this was also the position of Jesus himself. The kingdom is open to all, but the human interest is in the Israelite.

Great stress is laid in Q upon the severe demands Jesus makes of his disciples. They are to be persecuted and tried; they are warned not to be afraid of those who can only kill the body. Home ties are to be broken; they must bear the cross of Christ. Everyone must count the cost. Over against these things it is not an earthly but a heavenly hope which is offered. Possibly the emphasis here may be due to conditions in the time of the author, but the supporting testimony of Mark shows that these teachings had a large place in the life of Jesus.

If this is a fair presentation of the position taken by the source Q, does it not support the claim of a

primitive, apostolic origin for this source? Harnack is very careful in his statement; he says:

> There is a strong balance of probability that Q is a work of St. Matthew; but more cannot be said. It is useless to discuss the historical and psychological question whether one of the Twelve could have composed such a compilation as Q; convincing reasons for or against cannot be discovered. From the so-called charge to the Apostles we can only conclude that behind the written record there stands the memory of an apostolic listener.

This much, at least, must be granted.[1] Harnack has shown that the estimate of Wellhausen is untenable.[2]

Furthermore, this conclusion finds confirmation in the external evidence. Thus far in our discussion the attempt has been made to let the Gospels speak for themselves. No presuppositions have been introduced, not consciously at least, from without. Relying solely upon this internal evidence, we have sought to reconstruct the source demanded by the phenomena observed in the non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke. We may now properly ask what relation this source bears to Papias' statement regarding

[1] See p. 249.

[1] See pp. 136 ff.

the logia of Matthew, which Eusebius quoted, *Hist.*, III, 39.

B. W. Bacon has carefully discussed this passage in the article "Logia" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Gospels*. He presents the view, now commonly held, that in this quotation Papias himself referred to the canonical Matthew, and he has also made it clear that τὰ λόγια could not have been the title of a first-century collection of Jesus' sayings. This term, Bacon goes on to argue, was substituted by Papias for an earlier λόγοι. Λόγοι was the term employed by Papias' authority. This is possible. But we must remember that the emphasis here is not upon τὰ λόγια. What Papias has been told is not that Matthew wrote *the logia*, but that he *wrote in Hebrew*, and everyone interpreted as he was able. One must therefore be careful in basing broad conclusions on this term. Moreover, if it could be shown that the title of the writing intended by Papias' authority included the term λόγια or λόγοι, it would still be a question what sort of a writing was thereby implied. At any rate, it would be entirely appropriate to the source which we have attempted to reconstruct. But this

leads only into the region of conjecture. Papias, himself, knew nothing about the content of this Hebrew, or more probably Aramaic, writing of which he speaks. He has supposed the canonical Matthew to be one of its translations. But he did have good authority for believing that there had been some Semitic writing associated with the Apostle Matthew, and that this writing was somehow connected with the First Gospel.

This testimony, which is confirmed by the unanimous tradition of the early church, has its strongest basis in the very title of the Gospel. It can be no mere arbitrary choice which has associated this Gospel with the obscure disciple Matthew. In view of such evidence, there is a strong probability that some part at least of the Gospel rests upon the authority of Matthew. Now if from the Gospel we subtract the source Mark and the source Q, there is nothing left which could have such a large place in the early tradition. There are, indeed, several valuable parables and some important teachings, but no fundamental, primitive source of any length can be constructed

out of them. The First Gospel is a combination of the source Q with Mark, to which the editor has added what other scattered material he has been able to find. It is also to be noticed that this is true of Matthew in a sense in which it cannot be said of Luke. There also Mark and Q are fundamental sources, but Luke has other sources which he, at times at least, even prefers to Mark. This is certainly the case in the Passion narratives. Again, while Luke has practically retained the sequence of Q, he has as far as possible transformed it from a collection of sayings to a narrative; Matthew, on the other hand, despite the complete readjustment of the material into new groups, has still retained the dominant interest and form of Q. If now the tradition of the church, whose primitiveness is guaranteed, not only by the testimony of Papias, but by the title of the Gospel, associates the First Gospel with a Hebrew writing by the disciple Matthew, and this tradition cannot have its justification in that Gospel as we have it, we naturally look to the source Q for the writing of the disciple. Furthermore, this conclusion, to

which the external evidence points, only confirms the impression that the source itself makes upon us. This mutual support of external and internal evidence is our justification for entitling the non-Markan common source of Matthew and Luke, "Matthew's Sayings of Jesus."

CHAPTER IX

MATTHEW'S SAYINGS OF JESUS AS RECONSTRUCTED

In any such reconstruction of a source as has been attempted in this thesis, much must be left doubtful. We can never hope to restore the exact wording of Matthew's Sayings of Jesus. Certain passages of Matthew and Luke may or may not have belonged to this source. Detailed results are here presented merely as a basis for future discussion. By having the material before him as a unit the reader will be better able to judge the cogency of many of the arguments which have been urged.

SECTION 1

Matt. 3:7–10; Luke 3:7–9.—(John said to the multitudes who came out to be baptized of him), You offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of repentance, and do not attempt[1] to say within yourselves, We have Abraham for

[1] Greek, ἄρξησθε.

our father, for I say to you that God can of these stones raise up children to Abraham. Even now the axe is laid at the root of the trees; every tree, therefore, which does not bear fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

Matt. 3:11, 12; Luke 3:16*b*, 17.—I baptize you with water, but he who comes after me is mightier than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to bear. He shall baptize you (with the Holy Spirit and) with fire; his winnowing shovel is in his hand to thoroughly cleanse his threshing floor, and to gather his wheat into the granary, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.[1]

SECTION 2

Matt. 4:1–11; Luke 4:1–13.—(Jesus was led up into the wilderness by the spirit to be tempted by the devil); and he ate nothing forty days and forty nights, and when they were completed he hungered. The devil said to him, If thou art the Son of God, command that this stone become bread. He answered and said, It is written,

[1] It is necessary to assume that some account of the baptism of Jesus directly followed this, introducing Jesus himself to the reader. See p. 140.

Man shall not live by bread alone. Then the devil took him to Jerusalem, and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, and said to him, If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and, on their hands they shall bear thee up lest thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus answered and said to him, It is also written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. Again the devil took him to a very high mountain, and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory, and said to him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt worship before me. Jesus answered and said to him, It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him only shalt thou serve. And when the devil had completed every temptation, he departed from him.

SECTION 3

Matt. 5:1 ff.; Luke 6:20–23.—(And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples and said:)[1] Blessed are

[1] The introduction to this discourse which stood in Q cannot be restored. Luke, however, certainly stands closer to the common source. "Disciples" here as elsewhere in Q means the larger circle of followers, not the Twelve exclusively.

ye poor, for yours is the Kingdom of God. Blessed are ye hungry, for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye who weep, for ye shall laugh. Blessed are ye when they shall reproach you and persecute you and say all manner of evil against you for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets who were before you.

Matt. 5:39 ff.; Luke 6:27–36.—I say to you who hear, Love your enemies,[1] and pray for those who despitefully use you. Whoever smites you on one cheek turn to him the other also. And if anyone would take away thy cloak, let him have thy coat also.[2] Give to him who asks of thee; and from him who would borrow of thee turn not thou away. And as ye would that men should do to you do ye also to them likewise. And if ye love those who love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethen only what do ye more than

[1] Luke's addition here may have stood in Q: "Do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you."

[2] Matthew here adds another illustration, "And whoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two."

others? do not even the Gentiles the same?[1] But love your enemies, and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High;[2] for he causeth his sun to shine on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. Be ye therefore merciful as your Father is merciful.

Matt. 7:1 ff.; Luke 6:37–49.—And judge not and ye shall not be judged; for with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you. Wherefore beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye but regardest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me cast the mote out of thine eye; and behold, the beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast the beam out of thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye. For there is no good tree that

[1] Luke seems here to have expanded his source, interpreting it very appropriately.

[2] Harnack thinks that τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν stood in Q, but without Matthew's addition, τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, which hardly suits the context.

beareth corrupt fruit, nor again a corrupt tree that beareth good fruit. For each tree is known by its own fruit. For of thorns they do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes. The good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good, and the evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth that which is evil. For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

Why do ye call me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? Everyone who heareth my words and doeth them, I will show you whom he is like. He is like a man who built his house upon the rock. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house; and it fell not, for it had been founded upon the rock. And everyone who heareth these my words and doeth them not is like a man who built his house upon the sand. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house; and it fell, and great was the fall thereof.

And it came to pass, when he finished his words, he went to Capernaum.

SECTION 4

Matt. 8:5–10, 13; Luke 7:1–10.—A certain centurion's servant was sick.[1] (When he heard concerning Jesus, he sent to him elders of the Jews, asking him to come and save his servant. They came to Jesus and[2] besought him, saying, He is worthy that thou shouldest do this for him; for he loves our nation and he built the synagogue for us. And Jesus went with them. And then, when he was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends,) saying, Lord,[3] I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof;[4] but only say the word and my servant shall be healed. For I myself am a man under authority with soldiers under me; and I say to this one, Go, and he goes;

[1] Matthew defines the disease as *παραλυτικός*, but this term seems to be very loosely employed in the First Gospel, and without the support of Luke cannot be credited to Q.

[2] *σπουδαίως* is not a characteristic Lukan term: it occurs only here in Luke or Acts, but it may well have been added by the evangelist for dramatic effect.

[3] Luke adds, "Trouble not thyself." But Matthew seems to have preserved this speech of the centurion very carefully.

[4] Luke adds, "Wherefore neither deemed I myself worthy to come to thee." This attributes to faith what was more probably due to respect for Jewish prejudices.

and to another, Come and he comes; and to my servant, Do this, and he does it. When Jesus heard, he marvelled, and said to those who followed, Verily,[1] I say to you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And they who were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole.[2]

SECTION 5

Matt. 11:2–19; Luke 7:18–35.—John[3] summoned two of his disciples and sent them to the Lord, saying, Art thou he that cometh or look we for another? And he answered and said to them, Go and tell John the things which ye hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised, and the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed is he, who shall find no occasion of stumbling in me.

[1] ἀμήν seems to have been avoided by Luke. He frequently omits it from Mark.

[2] This last verse may not have been in Q.

[3] Harnack accepts Matthew's introduction in 11:2. But the reference to John's being in prison preparing for the narrative of Mark 6:17–29, and the phrase τὰ ἔργα τοῦ χριστοῦ are certainly editorial. κύριος of Luke preserves the characteristic Q designation of Jesus.

As these went their way, he began to say to the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken by the wind? But what went ye out to see? a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold they who wear soft raiment are in king's houses. But what went ye out to see? a prophet? Yea, I say to you, and much more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. Verily, I say to you, Among those who are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John; yet he that is least in the Kingdom of God is greater than he.

To what shall I liken this generation? and what is it like? It is like children sitting in the market places, who call to their fellows and say, We piped to you and ye did not dance; we wailed and ye did not mourn. For John came neither eating nor drinking, and ye say, He hath a demon. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! But wisdom is justified of her children.

SECTION 6

Matt. 8:19–22; Luke 9:57–62.—One came and said to him: I will follow thee wherever thou goest. And Jesus said to him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head. And he said to another, Follow me. But he said, Permit me first to go and bury my father. He said to him, Leave the dead to bury their own dead; but go thou and proclaim[1] the Kingdom of God. (Another also said,[2] I will follow thee, Lord: but first permit me to bid farewell to those who are at my house. Jesus said to him, No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of God.)

SECTION 7

Matt. 9:35—10:15; Luke 10:2–12.—(Jesus) said to his disciples, The harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few. Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that he send forth laborers

[1] διαγγέλλω is probably a Lukan substitute for the more common κηρύσσω.

[2] This third saying is not given by Matthew, and may not have stood in Q; but see p. 46.

into his harvest. And Jesus sent (them)[1] forth and charged them, saying, Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Carry no purse, no wallet, no shoes, and salute no one by the way. As ye enter a house, first say, Peace be to this house. And if a son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon him, but if not, it shall return to you. Remain in that house, eating and drinking what things they give you; for the laborer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. And into whatever city ye enter and they receive you, heal the sick therein and say to them, The Kingdom of God is come nigh you. But into whatever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go out into its streets and say, Even the dust from your city which cleaves to our feet we wipe off against you; nevertheless, know this, that the Kingdom of God is nigh. I say to you, It shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom,[2] than for that city.

[1] Matthew here has substituted "these twelve," defining the more general "disciples" of Q in accordance with Mark, chap. 6.

[2] "Sodom" alone makes the comparison more pointed, but Matthew, as we might expect, has given the full Old Testament reference, "the land of Sodom and Gomorrah."

SECTION 8

Matt. 11:21–23; 10:16; Luke 10:13–16, 3.—Woe to thee, Chorazin! Woe to thee, Bethsaida! for if in Tyre and Sidon the mighty works had been done, which were done in you, they would have repented long ago in sack-cloth and ashes. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted to heaven? to Hades shalt thou be cast down. He who heareth you heareth me, and he who rejecteth you rejecteth me, and he who rejecteth me rejecteth him who sent me.[1] Go your way! Behold I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves. Be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves.

SECTION 9

Luke 10:17–20.—And[2] the (disciples) returned with joy, saying, Lord, even the demons are subject to us in thy name. He said to them, I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven. Behold I

[1] See pp. 50 f. for the insertion of this verse here.

[2] It is to be remembered that in this section we have no parallel in Matthew by which we might eliminate minor variations of Luke.

have given you authority to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall in any wise hurt you. But in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject to you; but rejoice rather that your names are written in heaven.

SECTION 10

Matt. 11:25–27; Luke 10:21–22.—At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst conceal these things from the wise and prudent, and reveal them to babes. Yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing before thee. All things were delivered to me by my Father, and no one knoweth the Son except the Father, neither knoweth anyone the Father except the Son and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him.

SECTION 11

Matt. 13:16, 17; Luke 10:23, 24.—(And he said) Blessed are the eyes which see what ye see. Verily I say to you that many prophets and kings desired to see what ye see and saw not, and to hear what ye hear and heard not.

SECTION 12

Matt. 6:9–12; Luke 11:1–4.—One of his disciples said to him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. And he said to them, When ye pray, say, Father, hallowed be thy name; thy Kingdom come; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors; and lead us not into temptation.

Luke 11:5–8.—And he said to them, Who of you shall have a friend and shall go to him at midnight and say to him, Friend, lend me three loaves, for a friend of mine has come to me from a journey, and I have nothing to set before him. And he from within shall answer and say, Trouble me not; the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee? (Verily) I say to you, Though he will not rise and give him because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will arise and give him as many as he needeth.

Matt. 7:7–11; Luke 11:9–13.—And I say to you, Ask and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened to you.

For every one who asketh receiveth, and he who seeketh findeth, and to him who knocketh it shall be opened. Or what man is there of you, who, if his son shall ask him for a loaf, will give him a stone? Or if he shall ask for a fish, will give him a serpent? If therefore ye who are evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give good things to those who ask him.

SECTION 13

Matt. 12:22–30; Luke 11:14–23.—And he was casting out a demon, which was dumb.[1] And it came to pass that, when the demon went out, the dumb man spoke. (And the multitudes were amazed and said, It was never so seen in Israel.[2]) But some of them said, By Beelzebul, the prince of demons, he casts out demons. Others, trying him, asked of him a sign from heaven. He, knowing their thoughts, said to them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and

[1] The Semitic idiom in this introduction of Luke, *καὶ αὐτό*, shows that he here preserves Q.

[2] This sentence is added from Matt. 9:33 and may belong to Q.

house falleth upon house. If Satan also is divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? for ye say that by Beelzebul I cast out demons. If I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore they shall be your judges. But if I by the finger of God cast out demons, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you. When the strong man fully armed guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace; but when one stronger than he comes and conquers him, he takes his armor wherein he trusted, and distributes his spoils. He who is not with me is against me, and he who gathereth not with me scattereth.

SECTION 14

Matt. 12:43–45; Luke 11:24–26.—When the unclean spirit has come out from the man, he passeth through waterless places seeking rest and findeth it not. And he saith, I will return to my house whence I came out. He cometh and findeth it swept and garnished. Then he goeth and taketh with him seven spirits more evil than himself; and they enter in and dwell there; and the last state of the man becometh worse than the first.

SECTION 15

Matt. 12:39–42; Luke 11:29–36.—(And he said), An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign, and no sign shall be given to it but the sign of Jonah. For even as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold what is greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold what is greater than Solomon is here.

The lamp of the body is thine eye.[1] As therefore thy body, when it hath not a bright lamp, is dark, so when the lamp shineth, it giveth thee light. Look therefore whether the light that is in thee be not darkness.

SECTION 16

Matt. 23:4 ff.; Luke 11:39–52.—And the Lord said, Now ye Pharisees cleanse the outside of the

[1] The emended text of Jülicher is here used.

cup and the platter, but your inward part is full of extortion and wickedness. Ye foolish ones, did not he who made the outside make the inside also?[1] But woe to you Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law—justice, and mercy, and faith. Woe to you Pharisees! for ye love the chief seats in the synagogues and the greetings in the market places. Woe to you (Pharisees)! for ye are as sepulchres which appear not, and the men who walk over them know it not.

And he said, Woe to you scribes also! For ye bind heavy burdens and lay them on men's shoulders; but you yourselves will not move them with your finger. Woe to you scribes![2] for ye compass the sea and the dry land to make one proselyte; and when he becomes so, ye make him twofold more a son of Gehenna than yourselves. Woe to you scribes! for ye shut the Kingdom of God against men. You yourselves do not

[1] Luke 11:41 has been omitted in the text. What, if anything, stood here in Q can no longer be determined. Matt. 23:26 seems to follow some other source, and Luke 11:41 in its present form cannot be original.

[2] Luke 11:45 may have stood in Q.

enter, neither do ye permit those who come to enter.

(And he said), Woe to you, for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets and your fathers killed them. So ye are witnesses and sharers in the works of your fathers. For they killed them and ye build their sepulchres. Therefore, also, the Wisdom of God said, I will send them prophets and wise men and scribes, and some of them they shall kill and persecute; that the blood of all the prophets which has been shed upon the earth may come upon this generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zachariah, who was slain between the altar and the sanctuary. Verily I say to you, it shall be required of this generation.

SECTION 17

Matt. 10:24–33; 12:32; Luke 12:1–12.— And he said to his disciples, Beware[1] of the leaven

[1] It may be that Matthew instead of Luke preserves here what originally stood in Q. "A disciple is not above his teacher, neither a servant above his master. It is sufficient for the disciple that he become as his teacher, and the servant as his lord. If they called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more those of his household!"

of the Pharisees which is hypocrisy.[1] There is nothing covered which shall not be revealed, and hidden which shall not be known. What was said in the darkness shall be heard in the light, and what was heard in the ear shall be proclaimed upon the housetops. And fear not those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. Fear rather him who can destroy both soul and body in Gehenna. Are not five sparrows sold for two pennies? and not one of them shall fall to the ground without God. But even the hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows. Every one who shall confess me before men, him shall also the Son of Man[1] confess before the angels of God. He who denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God. And whoever saith anything against the Son of Man, it shall be fogriven him; but against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven. And when they bring you before the synagogues, and the rulers, and the authorities, be not anxious how or what ye shall answer, or what ye shall say; for

[1] Matthew here has "I" for "Son of Man." This may be original.

the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that hour what ye ought to say.

SECTION 18

Matt. 6:19–21, 25–34; Luke 12:22–34.—He said to his disciples, Therefore I say to you, Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat; nor for your body, what ye shall wear. Is not the life more than the food and the body than the raiment? Behold the ravens, that they sow not, neither do they reap nor gather into barns; and God feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they? Who of you by being anxious can add one cubit to the measure of his life? And why are ye anxious about raiment? Consider the lilies, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin. But I say to you that not even Solomon in all his glory was arrayed like one of these. If God doth thus clothe the grass, which is in the field to-day and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Be not therefore anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For all these things the Gentiles seek; for your Father knoweth that ye need these things.

But seek his kingdom and these things shall be added to you.[1] Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust consume, and where thieves break through and steal. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where moth and rust do not consume, and where thieves do not break through and steal. For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.

SECTION 19

Matt. 24:42–51; Luke 12:35–46.—Let your loins be girded and your lamps be burning; and be ye yourselves like men waiting for their lord, when he shall return from the marriage feast; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may immediately open to him. Blessed are those servants, whom their lord when he cometh shall find watching. And if he shall come in the second watch, and if in the third watch, and shall find them so, blessed are they.

[1] Matthew adds, "Therefore be not anxious for the morrow, for the morrow will be anxious for itself; sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." This probably stood in Q, but it is hard to think that it was there in exactly the same context.

Know this, that if the master of the house had known in what watch the thief was coming, he would have watched and he would not have permitted his house to be broken through. Therefore be ye also ready, for in an hour when ye think not the Son of Man cometh.

Who then is the faithful and prudent servant, whom his lord hath placed over his household to give them their portion of food in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say to you, that he will place him over all his possessions. But if that servant saith in his heart, My lord delayeth, and shall begin to beat his fellow-servants, and shall eat and drink with the drunken; the lord of that servant shall come on a day when he expecteth him not, and at an hour when he knoweth not, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the unfaithful.

SECTION 20

Matt. 10:34–36; Luke 12:51–53.—I came to send fire upon the earth, and how I wish that it were already kindled! I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how I am straitened until it be

accomplished! Think ye that I came to send peace upon the earth? I came not to send peace but a sword. For I came to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes shall be those of his own household.[1]

SECTIONS 21 AND 22

Matt. 16:2, 3; 5:25, 26; Luke 12:54–59.— And he said to the multitudes, When ye see a cloud rising in the west, straightway ye say, A shower is coming, and so it cometh to pass. And when ye see a south wind blowing, ye say, There will be a scorching heat, and it cometh to pass. Ye hypocrites, ye know how to judge the face of the heaven, but can ye not judge the signs of the times? And why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right? Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art with him in the way, lest haply the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. Verily I say to thee, Thou shalt not come out thence, till thou payest the last farthing.

[1] This last clause may be a Matthean addition from Mic. 7:6.

SECTION 23

Luke 13:1–9.—Certain ones[1] told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And he answered and said to them, Think ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they have suffered these things? I tell you, Nay; but except ye repent, ye all shall likewise perish. Or those eighteen upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed, think ye that they were offenders above all the men who dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay; but except ye repent, ye all shall likewise perish. And he spoke this parable. A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard, and he came seeking fruit thereon and he found none. He said to the vine dresser, Behold these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none; cut it down; why doth it also cumber the ground? But he answered and said to him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it and dung it; and if it bear fruit henceforth, well; but if not, thou shalt cut it down.

[1] The introductory sentence of Q can only be conjectured.

SECTION 24

Matt. 13:31–33; Luke 13:18–21.—And he said, What is the Kingdom of God like, and to what shall I compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and cast into his field; and it grew and became a tree, and the birds of the heaven lodged in the branches thereof. And again he said, To what shall I liken the Kingdom of God? It is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened.

SECTION 25

Matt. 7:13, 14; Luke 13:23, 24. (And one said to him, Lord, are they few that are saved?)[1] He said to them, Enter in by the narrow gate: for broad and wide is the way which leadeth to destruction, and many are they who enter thereby; for narrow is the gate and straitened the way which leadeth to life, and few are they who find it.

Matt. 7:21–23; Luke 13:25–27.—Many shall say to me in that day, Lord, did we not eat before thee, and drink, and didst thou not teach in our streets? Then shall I confess to them, I tell you,

[1] This introductory question may not have stood in Q.

I know not whence you are, depart from me, all ye who work iniquity.

Matt. 8:11, 12; Luke 13:28, 29.—There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the Kingdom of God, and yourselves cast out. And they shall come from the east and west and shall sit in the Kingdom of God.

SECTION 26

Matt. 23:37–39; Luke 13:34, 35.—O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who slayeth the prophets and stoneth those who are sent to her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold your house is forsaken. For I say to you, ye shall not see me henceforth until ye shall say, Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord.

SECTION 27

Matt. 10:37–39; Luke 14:25–35.—He said to the multitudes,[1] Whoever doth not hate[2] his

[1] Luke has probably expanded here to suit his context.

[2] Matthew has "love more than me," which, though probably not original, is a correct interpretation of the stronger term of Luke.

father and mother cannot be my disciple, and whoever doth not hate[1] his son and daughter cannot be my disciple, and whoever doth not take his cross and follow after me, cannot be my disciple. Who of you, wishing to build a tower, doth not first sit down and count the cost, whether he have wherewith to complete it? Lest when he hath laid a foundation and is unable to finish, all who behold begin to mock him, saying, This man began to build and could not finish. Or what king, going to engage in war with another king, will not first sit down and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet one who cometh against him with twenty thousand? Or else, while the other is yet far off, he sendeth an embassy and asketh conditions of peace. Salt is good, but if even the salt hath lost its savor, wherewith shall it be seasoned. It is fit neither for the land nor for the dunghill; men cast it out.

SECTION 28

Matt. 18:12–14; Luke 15:3–10.—And he told them this parable, saying, What man of you, if he have a hundred sheep and one of them go astray,

[1] See footnote 2, page 243.

will not leave the ninety and nine on the hills, and go and seek the one which hath strayed? And if he happen to find it he layeth it on his shoulders rejoicing. And when he cometh home, calleth his friends and neighbors, saying to them, Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which went astray.

Or what woman, if she have ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a lamp, and sweep the house, and seek diligently until she find it? And when she findeth it, she calleth her friends and neighbors, saying, Rejoice with me, for I have found the piece which I lost.

Matt. 6:24; Luke 16:13.—No one can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other; or he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon.

Matt. 11:12, 13; Luke 16:16.—All the prophets and the law prophesied until John; from that time until now the Kingdom of God suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force. And if you are willing to receive it, he is Elias who is about to come.

Matt. 5:18; Luke 16:17.—It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one jot or tittle of the law to fall.

Matt. 5:32; Luke 16:18.—Everyone who putteth away his wife maketh her an adulteress, and whoever shall marry her who is put away committeth adultery.

Matt. 18:6, 7; Luke 17:1, 2.—It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come, but woe to him through whom they come. It were profitable for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck, and he should be thrown into the sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble.

Matt. 18:15, 21, 22; Luke 17:3, 4.—Take heed to yourselves; if your brother sin rebuke him, and if he repent forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times a day and seven times turn again to thee saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him.

Matt. 17:20; Luke 17:5, 6.—If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say to this sycamore, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea; and it would obey you.

(Luke 17:7–10 possibly belongs among these miscellaneous sayings. Matt. 5:14; 7:6; 13:44–46; 18:10 may be taken from Q, but their original position cannot be recovered.)

SECTION 29

Matt. 24:26–28; Luke 17:20–25.—(They asked him,[1] saying, When cometh the Kingdom of God? He answered them and said, The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Behold here or there, for behold the Kingdom of God is in your midst.[2]) And he said to his disciples, The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and ye shall see it not. And they will say to you, Behold he is in the wilderness; go not forth. Behold he is in the inner chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out from the east and is seen even to the west, so shall the Son of Man be in his day. Wherever the carcase is, there will the vultures be gathered together. But first it is

[1] Luke reads here, "Being asked by the Pharisees." But it is doubtful whether this was the introduction which stood in Q.

[2] Or, "within you."

necessary that he suffer many things and be rejected of this generation.

Matt. 24:37–41; Luke 17:26–37.—And just as it came to pass in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of Man. For as in the days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day Noah entered the ark, and they knew not until the flood came and took them all; so shall it be on the day when the Son of Man appeareth. Likewise[1] even as in the days of Lot, they bought and sold, they planted and builded until that day when Lot went out of Sodom, and they knew not until it rained fire and brimstone from heaven and destroyed them all, so shall it be in the day when the Son of Man appeareth. There shall be two men in the field; the one is taken and the one is left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; one is taken and one is left.

SECTION 30

Matt. 25:14–30; Luke 19:11–28.—(And he said), It is as when a man going into a far country

[1] A conjectural restoration of the Q text has here been attempted, on the basis of the Matthean parallel for the first comparison.

called his own servants, and delivered to them his goods. And to one he gave five pounds, to another two, to another one, to each according to his ability. After a long time the lord of those servants cometh and maketh a reckoning with them. And he who received the five pounds came and brought five other pounds, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst to me five pounds; behold I have gained five other pounds. His lord said to him, Well done, good servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord. And he also who received the two pounds came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst to me two pounds, behold, I have gained two other pounds. His lord said to him, Well done, good servant, thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord. But he who had received the one pound came and said, Lord, I knew thee, that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou didst not sow, gathering where thou didst not scatter; and I was afraid and went away and hid thy talent in the earth. Behold thou hast thine own. And his lord answered and said to him, Thou wicked servant, thou knewest that I reap where

I did not sow, that I gather where I did not scatter; thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the bankers, and I at my coming should have required it with interest. Take ye away therefore from him the pound, and give it to him who hath ten pounds. For to everyone who hath shall be given, but from him who hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away.

21882

BS
2555
.C3

20,882

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

NO LONGER PROPERTY OF
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

S0-CHH-239